



Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge

Early Learning Challenge Annual Performance Report

Michigan,
2017

Due: February 28, 2018

CFDA Number: 84.412
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: October 31, 2019

APR Instructions

Overview:

This Annual Performance Report (APR) should be completed with several audiences in mind: your project officers at the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services (the Departments); Congress; and the general public. The Departments will use this APR as a way to measure the progress of your grant and apprise the field of your work. All APRs are due on or before February 28, 2018.

The APR should explain clearly the progress you made against your State Plan during the past twelve months. It should also explain any challenges encountered, including delays in implementation or spending, and how those challenges are being addressed.

Because this report will be public, remember to clearly define terms and spell out acronyms that might not be commonly understood.

Submission expectations and timelines:

- This APR is due in electronic form to your project officers on or before February 28, 2018.
- An attached excel workbook with complete performance measure data should be included with your APR form to your project officers by the above date.
- Please address any questions in writing to your project officers.
- APRs will be posted on the ED.gov website.

APR Submission Forms:

This APR form includes the following types of request for information:

1. Checklists – ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ and, in some cases, ‘check all that apply,’ followed by narrative explanations. If you do not check some of the boxes, please note the reason.
2. Narrative boxes – describe progress made during the reporting period.

A separate excel workbook will be provided to you to collect performance measure data.

You must submit data on all performance measures addressed in your ELC approved application: (B)(2)(c); (B)(4)(c)(1); (B)(4)(c)(2); (C)(3)(d); (D)(2)(d)(1); (D)(2)(d)(2)). For all areas where performance measure targets have not been met, describe strategies used to ensure measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

Instructions on Specific Sections:

Cover Sheet –

- PR/Award #: as per grant award document
- Grantee Name: as per grant award document
- Grantee address: as per grant award document
- Project Director Name, Title, phone, fax, email: as per grant award document
- Reporting period: January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017
- Indirect Cost Information: provide information about Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) as applicable
- Certification: check boxes for MIECHV, section 619 parts B and C, CCDF.
- Authorized Representative: The Governor or the person authorized by the Governor to sign grant documents must sign this form.

Executive Summary –

- Provide a summary of the progress made towards your State Plan (the plan you set forth in your approved application and in the Scope of Work you developed) during the past 12 months. This summary should function as a stand-alone document that provides a high-level overview of the status of early learning in your State.

Narrative Boxes –

- There is a suggested limit of 1,000-words for each narrative box.
- Please be specific, clear, and concise. You may use bullets for the narrative. Graphics should not be included.
- Illustrate the progress made during the year and over the course of the grant with specific examples and data. Describe special initiatives that may be unique to your State. Include challenges as well as successes, and describe how challenges were resolved.

Performance Measures (Tables (B)(2)(c); (B)(4)(c)(1); (B)(4)(c)(2); (C)(3)(d); (D)(2)(d)(1); and (D)(2)(d)(2)) --

- Do not reformat tables.
- Do not revise your approved performance measure targets and baseline data without prior approval from your project officer.
- Use the completed tables in your previous APR to provide previous years' data.
- Enter zero when the number is actually zero, not to indicate missing data. Provide best estimate or leave the space blank if data is unavailable.
- When completing a row labeled "Other" or "Specify", add explanatory text.
- Each Performance Measure is followed by a Data Notes section. In the Data Notes sections, provide descriptive information that will help the reader understand your data. For example, provide explanations for these types of occurrences in the data:
 - You are unable to report data, or have zero counts or low numbers.
 - Increases and decreases in your numbers, especially when the total number of programs or children in the State decline or increase, or you report a decrease in actuals compared to the prior year.
 - The source of the data or methodology used to collect it, including any error or data quality information.
 - Methods used to calculate data that will not be apparent to the reader.
 - What numerator and denominator were used to calculate percentages?
 - If baseline data are actual or estimated.
 - Any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Budget and Expenditure Tables --

- These tables request budget and expenditure information for the final reporting year. Expenditures should be reported based on your State's definition of "expenditures" (for example, funds that have been obligated but not yet drawn down from G5). Please indicate how your State defines this term.
- Project officers will expect explanations for any significant discrepancies between your approved budget and your expenditures for the final reporting year. You should explain the reasons for the discrepancy (for example, a delay in making a contract award).

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet	1
Certification	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Successful State Systems.....	3
Governance Structure	13
Stakeholder Involvement	14
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	16
Participating State Agencies.....	19
High-Quality, Accountable Programs.....	20
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	20
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	23
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	26
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	29
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	31
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)	34
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	36
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	38
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	39
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	40
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	40
Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)	41
Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application).....	42
Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)	48
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)	49
Early Childhood Education Workforce	53
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	53
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)	54
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	57
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	57
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	61
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)	61
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	62
Data Tables	68
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	68
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	69

Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	71
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	73
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	74
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	77
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	79
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State	80
Budget and Expenditure Tables	82
Budget Summary Table	82
Budget Table: Project 1 – Name of Project	85
Budget Table: Project 2 – Name of Project	87
Budget Table: Project 3 – Name of Project	89
Budget Table: Project 4 – Name of Project	91
Budget Table: Project 5 – Name of Project	93
Budget Table: Project 6 – Name of Project	95
Budget Table: Project 7 – Name of Project	97
Budget Table: Project 8 – Name of Project	99
Budget Table: Project 9 – Name of Project	101
Budget Table: Project 10 – Name of Project	103
Budget Table: Project 11 – Name of Project	105
Budget Table: Project 12 – Name of Project	107
Budget Table: Project 13 – Name of Project	109
Budget Table: Project 14 – Name of Project	111
Budget Table: Project 15 – Name of Project	113
Budget Table: Project 16 – Name of Project	115
Budget Table: Project 17 – Name of Project	117
Budget Table: Project 18 – Name of Project	119

Note: All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the **Grantee** as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cell in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.



APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: 412A130044
2. Grantee Name: Office of the Governor, State of Michigan
3. Grantee Address: 111 S Capitol, Lansing, Michigan 48909
4. Project Director Name: Shulawn Doxie

Title: Interim Deputy Superintendent, Office of Great Start, Michigan Department of Education

Phone #: (517)335-1995 Fax #: (517)335-4565

Email Address: DoxieS@Michigan.gov

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From 01/01/2017 to 12/31/2017

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018

Approving Federal agency: ☒ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other (Please specify):



Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (see section 511 of Title V of the Social Security Act, as added by section 2951 of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-148))

✓ Yes ☐ No

Programs authorized under section 619 of part B and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

✓ Yes ☐ No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

✓ Yes ☐ No

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Brian J. Whiston

Title: State Superintendent

 **Date:** [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Signature

Executive Summary

For the reporting year, please provide a summary of your State's (1) accomplishments, (2) lessons learned, (3) challenges, and (4) strategies you will implement to address those challenges.

Strengthened investment in high-quality early learning and development continues to energize educational improvement efforts in Michigan. From the governor's office and the legislature to local providers, business leaders, schools, and families, people are deeply committed to improving opportunities for young children with high needs in Michigan.

In 2013, the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start (MDE-OGS) held conversations with 1,400 parents of young children, educators, business leaders, and local and state program directors to inform development of a statewide plan to achieve Governor Snyder's stated outcomes for young children:

- Children are born healthy.
- Children are healthy, thriving, and developmentally on track from birth to third grade.
- Children are developmentally ready to succeed in school at the time of school entry.
- Children are prepared to succeed in fourth grade and beyond by reading proficiently at the end of third grade.

The resulting publication, entitled *Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future: The Plan for Early Learning and Development in Michigan*, illustrates that Michigan's citizens recognize the vital foundation that a system rich in parent involvement, community and state collaboration, and high-quality accessible early learning and development programs can provide for our youngest citizens.

Drawing from the guiding principles of this plan and with the identified outcomes for young children as a focal point, Michigan submitted a comprehensive application for a Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) competitive federal grant in 2013. As a result, Michigan was awarded \$51,737,456 for the purposes of improving early learning and development in the state over a period of four years, beginning January 2014 and ending December 2017. The grant is focused on the improvement of early childhood systems through: increasing access to high-quality programs for children with high needs; implementing and coordinating an integrated system of programs; and evaluating and rating program quality.

MDE-OGS was identified as the lead agency for RTT-ELC implementation in the grant application. Michigan prioritized its work into seven projects for improving early childhood outcomes for all children. These projects are designed to support the creation of a truly collaborative system of early learning and development – one that requires the collective efforts of policymakers, program directors, providers, and parents. The projects are as follows:

1. Grant Management and Governance;
2. Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality;
3. Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health;
4. Enhancing and Increasing Access to the Great Start to Quality System;
5. Improving the Early Learning and Development Workforce;
6. Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators; and
7. Increasing Family Engagement.

To execute these projects effectively, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiative involves the following key partners: the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC); Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS); the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget; and the Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC). (Note that the Michigan Department of Community Health and the Michigan Department of Human Services merged in 2015 to become the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services as described in the "Governance Structure" portion of this report.)

Through the various activities and initiatives within the seven RTT-ELC projects, we are striving to meet the following goals:

1. Increase access for children with high needs to high-quality early learning programs;
2. Increase opportunities for licensed and unlicensed home-based providers to improve the quality of their programs;
3. Ensure meaningful engagement of families in their children's early learning and development;
4. Promote children's physical, social, and emotional health;
5. Expand education and professional learning opportunities, especially for home-based providers;
6. Build an early learning data system that provides information (anonymously and in aggregate) on children across departments and programs.

Building upon the foundation that was established during the first two years of Michigan's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, the Grant Implementation Group convened during Years 3 and 4 on a bi-monthly basis and held monthly monitoring meetings with individual RTT-ELC. This infrastructure has allowed for significant progress on activities within each of Michigan's seven projects. Michigan's RTT-ELC Year 4 early learning developments, accomplishments, and challenges are organized by the five key areas defined by the federal RTT-ELC competition:

1. Establishing Successful State Systems

In establishing the Office of Great Start (OGS) in 2011, Governor Snyder laid out OGS's charge to (a) align, consolidate, and/or integrate early childhood funding and related programs around the state's early childhood outcomes, and (b) coordinate the state's policy, budget, and programs for early childhood. As such, OGS coordinates and aligns the state's early learning and development investments for children with high needs in close and regular collaboration with senior staff from MDHHS and ECIC to work toward achieving our early childhood outcomes. OGS oversees the ECIC's implementation of our Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. OGS also partners with Michigan's intermediate school districts (ISDs) to ensure coordination between state-level early childhood efforts and that of local early childhood collaborative bodies and parent coalitions, with the goal of balancing both local and state perspectives in decision making, accountability, and policy. Fifty-four Great Start Collaboratives (GSCs) serve all 83 Michigan counties and members consist of public and private community leaders, including parents. Each GSC has a partner organization called a Great Start Parent Coalition (GSPC), comprised of passionate local volunteers and coordinated by a paid Parent Liaison, who educate community and state leaders about the importance of investing in young children and provide the "parent voice" to inform the GSCs' decision making.

Through RTT-ELC initiatives, Michigan works to further strengthen this coordination and collaboration both across partner agencies and state and local networks. The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Convening the RTT-ELC Grant Implementation Group bi-monthly for the purpose of collaborative worktime between grant partners and developing a shared understanding of RTT-ELC progress;
- Convening the Great Start Operations Team monthly, guiding operational coordination of interagency initiatives that align with the Governor's early childhood outcomes for the population's 0-8-year olds;
- Convening the Great Start Systems Team quarterly, engaging senior staff of the state agencies that report to the Governor through what is known as the People's Group. The purpose of this team is to assess, align and direct the implementation of the policies across the multiple agencies that contribute to the achievement of early childhood outcomes for the populations's 0-8-year olds;
- Convening an Early Childhood Data Governance Council comprised of State agency leadership to ensure that the data required to enable OGS to meet its strategic objectives are available, trusted and of consistent quality;
- Maintaining staffing to provide direct oversight to the scope of work and budget for individual grant partners;

- Obtaining local and stakeholder input/involvement for a number of RTT-ELC initiatives;
- Convening members of the Office of Great Start Advisory Council to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders across OGS initiatives, including RTT-ELC;
- Implementing a robust communication plan to effectively engage and inform all RTT-ELC partners and stakeholders;
- Contracting with Public Sector Consultants to collaborate with RTT-ELC grant partners for the development and implementation of a Sustainability Plan.

2. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

Michigan is committed to ensuring that children with high needs have greater access to high quality early learning programs, wherever such programs are delivered. Great Start to Quality (GSQ), our Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, is essential to achieving that goal. Through RTT-ELC, Michigan is working to develop and implement effective strategies for improving the quality of early learning programs by increasing participation in Great Start to Quality. Michigan's first goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to significantly increase access to high-quality early learning and development programs for children with high needs. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, while home-based providers are registered, and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Increase unlicensed provider participation in GSQ by providing training and consultation to support quality improvement of unlicensed providers;
- Increase home-based provider participation in GSQ in target communities through placement of regional Quality Improvement Specialists offering outreach and individualized technical assistance;
- Increase licensed provider participation in GSQ through participation bonuses targeted toward providers serving families at or below 185% of the federal poverty level;
- Increase licensed provider participation in GSQ through targeted offering of Quality Improvement Grants;
- Support licensing consultants to become ambassadors for GSQ.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Achieving 46% provider participation in Great Start to Quality, progressing toward Michigan's metric of 50% participation by the end of

the grant;

- Implementing the unlicensed, subsidized provider cohort project, to support this particular provider population. During 2017, a total of 337 unlicensed subsidized providers participated in some capacity in the cohorts. At the end of the year, 163 were participating across the nine cohorts. Of those currently participating, 112 have received the second level of the Quality Development Continuum and 59 have achieved the third level (8 of these participants achieved level 2 and went on to achieve level 3). Additionally, four cohort participants achieved licensure with the State of Michigan;
- Executing contracts for Great Start to Quality Resource Centers in targeted RTT-ELC communities to increase participation for family/group home providers;
- Implementing the GSQ participation incentives based on stakeholder feedback. The Participation Bonus was awarded to 774 programs and providers in Year 4;
- Implementing the Quality Improvement Grants based on stakeholder feedback. Quality Improvement Grants were awarded to 236 programs and providers during the third and final cycle; and
- Establishing a contract to implement Michigan's newly developed Professional Development Registry system.

Michigan's second goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to improve access to high-quality early learning programs and services for families and children system-wide. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Encourage participation of tribal and early childhood special education programs (Early Childhood Special Education/Section 619) in GSQ through system enhancements and stronger relationships with these programs;
- Streamline program monitoring efforts to allow licensing consultants to increase focus on improving program quality;
- Increase access to high-quality early learning and care programs in Pathways to Potential communities by providing scholarships. (Pathways to Potential is a community-based approach placing Michigan Department of Health and Human Services employees in schools where high numbers of families are already receiving public assistance through the Department. The Pathways approach targets five outcome areas: attendance, education, health, safety, and self-sufficiency. It also relies on a number of support networks and partnerships to wrap their arms around children and families to help them succeed.);
- Conduct outreach to families in Pathways to Potential communities to increase the percentage of families accessing high-quality early learning

and development programs.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Implementation of newly developed child care licensing key indicators;
- Maintaining a MDHHS Departmental Specialist position to provide critical support and assistance administering departmental responsibilities relating to RTT-ELC and to connect and align early childhood funding and programs across departments;
- Developing partnerships for outreach and engagement of tribal programs to encourage participation in GSQ;
- Receiving federal approval to amend the RTT-ELC Budget to repurpose child care scholarship funds toward sustainable approaches for increasing access to high-quality early learning and care programs (see Section B(1) of the report).

Michigan is implementing a strategy to promote early learning and development outcomes for children by expanding and improving efforts to engage families in meaningful ways and support their development as leaders for their own children and communities. Efforts will focus on increasing family access to skill development resources designed to promote the physical, social, and emotional health of their children. Therefore, Michigan's third goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to invest in family engagement and education strategies designed to increase access to high-quality early learning programs with an emphasis in Pathways to Potential communities. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Incorporate Strengthening Families™ (SF) Protective Factors into the GSQ program standards;
- Place Family Engagement Consultants in target communities to support parents and providers;
- Provide training modules about the GSQ Family and Community Partnerships standards;
- Assist families and providers in understanding and adopting protective factors into daily practice;
- Establish and coordinate networks of trusted advisors able to provide support to families in their local communities;
- Develop and distribute supplemental materials to support family understanding and interpretation of Kindergarten Entry Assessment data.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Maintaining a Family Engagement Specialist within the Office of Great Start to lead RTT-ELC efforts focusing on increasing family engagement;

- Conducting training sessions for Pathways to Potential Success Coaches to strengthen family engagement efforts in local communities;
- Hiring Family Engagement Consultants for strengthening parent engagement efforts in Pathways to Potential communities;
- Awarding a total of \$2,169,031 in grant funds across 43 Great Start Parent Coalitions (GSPC's) for the Trusted Advisors work. The goal of the Trusted Advisor Grants is to improve linkages to families with children birth to age five who are most difficult to engage in early learning and development programs and related community supports by disseminating culturally and linguistically appropriate materials and information about the importance of early childhood learning and development.;
- Completing a Gap Analysis amongst the Great Start to Quality Program Indicators, the Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs, the Michigan Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Prekindergarten, and the Program Quality Assessments for Pre-k, Infants & Toddlers, and Family Child Care. These indicators and standards will be compared with the Strengthening Families Framework to identify the adequacy in addressing the SF Protective Factors.

3. Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Michigan is also implementing a strategy to assist families and providers of early learning and care in supporting the healthy development and well-being of children with high needs. To accomplish this goal, Michigan is building on efforts already underway across the state to increase healthy behaviors through education and personal action.

Through RTT-ELC, these efforts will increase the availability of high-quality early learning programs that meet the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, with a focus on Pathways to Potential communities. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to help create an early learning and development system that supports the physical and social-emotional development of children from birth to eight years of age.

The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Align GSQ program standards with nationally recognized physical and social-emotional health standards;
- Develop training and technical assistance materials and supports that promote healthy habits for families and providers, as well as developmental screening and referral procedures;
- Provide consultants to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Convening a workgroup to implement the recommendations resulting from the Gap Analysis of the QRIS system standards with regard to children's health and safety by comparing them to the Caring for Our Children Stepping Stones national health and safety performance standards guidelines for early care and education programs;
- Maintaining staffing to focus on the work of Project 3, including a Health Coordinator leading the work of the Physical Health Consultants within the selected communities, as well as a Social Emotional Health Coordinator at MDHHS;
- Implementing a model for specialized consultation to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, including hiring the Physical Health and Social Emotional Health Consultants;
- Developing the evaluation for specialized consultation;
- Developing the assessment tools and training materials for Social Emotional and Physical Health Consultants;
- Completing the hiring, training, deploying and maintaining of all Physical Health and Social Emotional Health Consultants in the selected communities.

4. Supporting a Strong Early Childhood Education Workforce

Research shows the positive impact of a quality early childhood educator on a child's development. Therefore, Michigan is focused on ensuring that early childhood educators have the skills and knowledge they need to be successful. While supporting early childhood educators statewide, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiatives are targeting home-based providers who serve high needs children in their programs. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is that every young child in Michigan has access to an effective early childhood educator by 2020. The specific strategies being implemented and outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Expand online Child Development Associate (CDA) credential programs for early childhood educators;
- Increase the number of National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited community college early learning programs;
- Expand opportunities for home-based providers to earn a degree, as well as increase the supply of staff qualified to teach in Michigan's Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), through Teacher Education And Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) scholarships;
- Increase access to training focused on achieving GSQ standards for program administration.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 include:

- Contracting with a marketing agency to increase awareness of the existing programs that have emerged organically since the time of the RTT-ELC application;
- Providing financial support to eight colleges to pursue NAEYC accreditation and one college to pursue reaccreditation from NAEYC;
- Planning and implementing a Higher Education summit where the primary topic of discussion was improving available high quality online course offerings;
- Providing \$1,785,081.90 in T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to support 594 child care providers;
- Contracting with Public Consulting Group to develop, implement, and evaluate a Business Training model for home and center-based providers.

5. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Michigan is implementing a strategy to include data for all federal and state funded early learning programs in the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS). This will enable the state to better understand the quality of care and education experiences of our youngest learners. Michigan will ensure that these data are also available to families, educators, researchers, and others needing access to data to support early learning improvements. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to build an early learning data system that provides aggregated data across departments and programs. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Create a management structure that will plan, organize, regulate, and guide the collection of, access to, and use of MSLDS data;
- Improve the existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS) to create links to essential early childhood data elements;
- Increase access to data to improve program delivery and effectiveness, to inform resource investment and policy decisions, and to empower families to make better decisions for their children;
- Improve data collection about early childhood educators to help improve policies that impact Michigan's early childhood educators.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 4 includes:

- Continuing outreach to Head Start grantees to connect additional programs to MSLDS;
- Establishing and implementing a process for longitudinally tracking children who receive subsidized childcare services in Michigan;
- Developing a process for collecting and connecting Great Start to Quality data in MSLDS;

- Releasing two new Early Childhood reports, including “Pathways to Kindergarten” and “Early Childhood Impact on K-3 Absenteeism”;
- Maintaining a Data Specialist within MDE to coordinate efforts for establishing data collection elements for early learning programs and enhancing the existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

Year 4 Challenges:

Challenges discussed in previous years’ reports contributed to a slower than intended start for several activities; however, Year 4 included significant progress with the implementation of activities outlined in the RTT-ELC scope of work. Therefore, in 2017 Michigan applied for and was approved to receive a one year, no-cost extension to continue RTT-ELC activities through 2018.

During 2017, Michigan experienced staff turnover with three RTT-ELC positions, delaying progress on grant activities. At the end of 2017, two positions remained vacant, with low likelihood that these positions will be filled with only one year remaining in the grant. Also, relative to staffing in 2017, Michigan was unable to recruit a qualified Child Care Health Consultant for a region of the Upper Peninsula. Therefore, Michigan is drawing from the capacity of other Health Consultants to provide some services in the Upper Peninsula.

The state of Michigan launched a new financial and business management system in fall 2017, creating several challenges and significant delays in the procurement process. As such, in 2017 Michigan was not able to post two Request for Proposals (RFPs) to identify a contractor to conduct the validation study for our QRIS as well as the workforce study. Michigan anticipates that these RFPs will be posted early in 2018.

Successful State Systems

Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State (Section A(3) of Application)

Governance Structure

Please provide any relevant information and updates related to the governance structure for the RTT-ELC State Plan (specifically, please include information on the organizational structure for managing the grant, and the governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, State Advisory Council, and Participating State Agencies).

Participating State Agencies responsible for the implementation of grant projects and activities have been the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), what is currently known as the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB). The Lead Agency for the grant continues to be MDE, with the MDE Office of Great Start leading the implementation, management, and cross-partner collaboration efforts of the grant. In addition, the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) and Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC) are participating partner organizations and have significant responsibility for implementing numerous grant activities. Representatives from all partner agencies and organizations serve on the Grant Implementation Group for the purposes of coordination, communication, and collaboration.

Michigan's established state-level governance for its early childhood systems reform work continues to provide the overarching collaborative governance necessary to reach the established goals of the RTT-ELC State Plan. That structure allowed for collaborative decision-making to continue through 2017, even as significant transitions within MDHHS that began in 2015 continued through 2016 and into 2017. On February 6, 2015, Governor Snyder issued an Executive Order to reorganize the programs within the Department of Community Health and Department of Human Services, with the majority of the programs being placed into one state agency known as the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). One exception to the reorganization was the state entity tasked with the registration, licensing and monitoring of child care. Its new placement after the reorganization is within Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA).

The stability offered by the primary facilitation of RTT-ELC residing in the Office of Great Start (OGS) allowed work within the plan to move forward during these transitions over the past three years. OGS collaborates closely and regularly with senior staff from MDHHS, CEPI, ECIC, the Child Care Licensing Division within LARA, and MiAEYC to work toward achieving Michigan's early

childhood outcomes. The Great Start Systems Team contains senior state agency staff of these state agencies that report to the Governor through what is known as the People's Group; staff within those agencies with major responsibility for programs that impact the lives of young children convene on a monthly basis through the Great Start Operational Team, serving as statutorily required advisory and/or action committees for a variety of initiatives, including as the State Advisory Committee required under RTT-ELC. During 2017, the Great Start Operational Team fostered three specific cross-agency workgroups processing issues of importance to young children and their families. Those topics include improving immunization rates, exploring and addressing the model for supporting ongoing infant and early childhood mental health consultation, as well as addressing access, spread and reporting of results of developmental screening.

For RTT-ELC, the Grant Implementation Group meets bi-monthly to bring forth key issues that require enhanced coordination across systems and ensure that the projects have the cross-partner support to be successful.

Stakeholder Involvement

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

Michigan recognizes that coordination and collaboration in a comprehensive early learning and development system must go beyond state agencies and partner organizations to engage with key early childhood stakeholders from local communities across the state. As such, OGS established the OGS Advisory Council in October 2014 to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders. The 16-member council is inclusive of parents, local providers, and other community leaders from diverse economic and geographic backgrounds. The foundation for the projects and activities within RTT-ELC, *Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future: The Plan for Early Learning and Development in Michigan*, is testament to the importance of stakeholders in decisions made at the state level.

The OGS Advisory Council continues to guide and inform the implementation of the recommendations in the report, as well as system-building efforts across agencies. One initiative supported by RTT-ELC during 2017 was a cross system group of stakeholders who informed the development and implementation of a series of business trainings for child care providers. Continuing into 2017, the networks of providers established at the local Great Start to Quality Resource Centers informed further

development of policies that improve the delivery and effectiveness of the Great Start to Quality rating process.

Further stakeholder engagement during 2017 includes a committee that completed a Gap Analysis of family engagement indicators within the GSQ indicators. The Gap Analysis Committee formed for the family engagement indicators began meeting in November 2016 and included representation from MDE, MDHHS, home and center-based child care providers, parent liaisons and local Resource Centers. The recommendations of this committee were completed in spring 2017.

As the model for Specialized Consultation (described in section C(3) of this report) has been developed, stakeholders have been engaged at various points in the planning process, specifically as it pertains to determining the roles of the social emotional, physical health, and family engagement consultants, as the roles intersect with child care licensing consultants and quality improvement consultants at the Resource Centers. Implementation of this model occurred in 2017, with the state planning and implementation team comprised of cross agency leadership establishing mechanisms for obtaining local stakeholder feedback from across the state to make adjustments and engage in continuous quality improvement. Similarly, during 2017, feedback from the Great Start Collaboratives and Resource Centers informed communications throughout the Trusted Advisors Grant Application process.

In 2016, Public Sector Consultants prepared a report for the Michigan Department of Education entitled, "Building a Better Child Care System; What Michigan Can Do to Help More Parents and Children Access Quality Care." To further explore how Michigan can improve, PSC gathered input from over 1,000 individuals across the state, including parents, providers, advocates and administrators. The resulting report summarized their feedback and identified a number of ways to improve Michigan's child care system, particularly focusing on methods related to the state's child care subsidy. (The full report can be found here: [Building a Better Child Care System](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Building_a_Better_Child_Care_System_534366_7.pdf), or by utilizing the following URL:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Building_a_Better_Child_Care_System_534366_7.pdf.) In 2017, a cross-agency leadership team was assembled to generate and prioritize plans for addressing these recommendations, with work to continue into 2018.

During 2017 the implementation of the Professional Development Registry relied heavily on stakeholder research and input. Two work groups were convened with cross sector, cross setting, and cross funding representatives. The groups have been engaged in planning for communications and technical assistance for the ongoing implementation of this registry, with plans for full launch in spring 2018.

Finally, relative to promoting CDA online courses in the state of Michigan, stakeholders have been engaged to inform a marketing and communications plan to increase awareness of available programs across the state of Michigan.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

On January 5, 2016, Governor Snyder issued a proclamation declaring a state of emergency within the city of Flint due to significant lead contamination in the city water supply. All state agencies were charged with contributing to the coordination of response and assistance to the community of Flint. Within early childhood education and care, coordination of the additional resources that are provided for in a statewide effort are considered in the context of necessary targeted efforts. The state legislature identified supplemental funds in January to assist with services and supports to families with very young children, focusing on early intervention as well as screening, evaluation, behavioral supports, and attention to nutrition – all aiming to mitigate the negative effects of lead. Additional funds for both 2016 and 2017 were contained in appropriation bills that were signed into law in July of 2016, allowing families within the affected Flint zip codes with the following:

- four-year-old children universal access to state-funded preschool (Great Start Readiness Program);
- universal access to 20 hours/week of CCDF-financed child care for children birth through age three;
- sufficient funding to universally support children birth through age three with early intervention services;
- targeted funds to support the identification of and services for early childhood mental health care, and;
- supporting and serving as a state partner in foundation-led collaborative efforts to increase the availability of high-quality child care.

Throughout the year, state agency leaders met to discuss progress with local leaders as part of the Governor-initiated Flint Water Interagency Coordinating Committee (FWICC). The agency/departments directors were named to this committee and engaged their employees in communicating progress toward identified supports, as well as identified needs and challenges. Progress toward primary objectives is highlighted at www.michigan.gov/flintwater. The state leadership for RTT-ELC considered the needs of the early education and care of children in the Flint community and identified specific needs that were supported through enhanced efforts, such as maintenance of a second cohort of unlicensed subsidized providers (family, friend and neighbor care providers), in which the providers gathered, were supported in increasing their knowledge and skills related to child development

and care, and also connected with the enhanced community resources that came into the city as a result of the crisis.

As reported in Michigan's 2015 APR, Executive Order 2015-4 that formed the MDHHS and moved Child Care Licensing into LARA represented a significant shift for staff who had been collaborating over the years. The continuing impact of the reorganization was felt throughout 2016, though it began to stabilize in 2017.

In 2015, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) welcomed a new State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Brian Whiston. Mr. Whiston launched a broad stakeholder-informed process to determine overarching goals and strategies that will lead to Michigan's recognition as one of the top 10 states for educational outcomes within the next 10 years. The goals and strategies that are outlined in the plan require innovative approaches to address comprehensive evidence-based instruction and supports for the P-20 population. Efforts to increase preschool access and to enhance the foundations for family engagement are included. In order to both lead and coordinate efforts across MDE as well as with the breadth of stakeholders, MDE identified the need for a State Transformation Specialist who will engage the birth to third grade continuum and the transitions beyond. This Specialist was funded through 2017 with RTT-ELC resources. Further, identified efforts within the Top 10 in 10 plan are both informed and influenced by family engagement activities within Michigan's RTT-ELC. Examples include:

- Development of a P-20 Family Engagement Framework (Goal 5, Top 10 in 10) which includes stakeholder engagement and will pay particular attention to important transitions that children and families experience over the course of prenatal through age 20 years.
- Coordination of the various birth through age 8 workforce initiatives as part of the goal to "develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce."

Early literacy and the goal for children to be reading at grade level in third grade continued to be a high priority for both the Governor and the legislature. In July 2016, the Governor announced the creation of the PreK-12 Literacy Commission to provide policy recommendations and reports on the state's progress in becoming a national leader in literacy. In October 2016, initial appointments to that Commission were announced that coincided with the enactment of legislation that laid out expectations for intensive and coordinated supports for children in K-3 to ensure greater achievement in English language arts on the grade 3 state assessment. The RTT-ELC work in Michigan seeks to contribute to increasing the quality of settings prior to K entry, thus enabling stronger transitions into the K-3 settings in the state.

In 2016, Michigan adjusted its entrance income requirements for Child

Development and Care (CDC) subsidy from 121% FPL to 125% FPL to begin to expand access. An additional adjustment occurred in August 2017, expanding eligibility to 130% FPL. Also, in August 2017, data from the 2015 Market Rate Survey was utilized to increase child care provider payment rates, bringing Michigan closer to the recommended 75th percentile. Also pertaining to child care subsidy, the allowable timeframe for processing applications and making eligibility determinations changed from 45 days to a maximum of 30 days. This reduced the wait time for both families and providers related to eligibility determinations, as families were often asking child care providers to care for children without authorization, which was risky for their business; it also limited family choice/access to high quality settings. By reducing the time it takes for eligibility decisions we believe we are reducing barriers to high quality programs and parental choice. In October 2017, policy change occurred to ensure that a child continues to receive subsidy at the time they turn 13 until their full 12 months of eligibility expires. Another October 2017 policy change continued CDC subsidy eligibility for foster care children that are adopted by foster parents.

To assist child care providers with the cost of meeting new CCDF requirements for criminal history fingerprint checks, supplemental funding was provided in spring of 2017. In addition, funding for staffing was secured to help process the initial fingerprint check requirements. To ensure and improve the health and safety of children in child care settings, Michigan has completed hiring and training approximately 22 new child care licensing consultants over the course of 2017 and into 2018. Michigan also hired and trained two new managers covering two new regions (increasing covered regions from six to eight) to help reduce coverage area sizes. Both changes have allowed licensing consultants' caseloads to fall from approximately 1:146 to 1:102. Michigan will monitor fluctuations in the number of licensees from month to month as well as any impact that changes to Michigan's child care licensing law may have on the provider community.

Section 104 of Public Act 108 of 2017 (PA108) authorizes the phased in implementation of the Michigan Kindergarten Entry Observation beginning by the fall of 2018. The expectation is that by 2020, all publicly supported Kindergarten classrooms in Michigan will be using the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) tool developed for the Maryland and Ohio Departments of Education in partnership with WestED and Johns Hopkins University. The KRA tool was piloted in 2016. In 2017 several Intermediate School Districts and local districts continued to utilize this tool.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

There have been no changes in participating state agencies to report for 2017.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application)

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- ☒ State-funded preschool programs
- ☒ Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- ☐ Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- ☒ Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- ☒ Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
 - ☒ Center-based
 - ☒ Family Child Care

If yes, these standards address or are aligned with (please check all that apply):

- ☒ Early learning and development standards
- ☒ A comprehensive assessment system
- ☒ Early childhood educator qualifications
- ☒ Family engagement strategies
- ☒ Health promotion practices
- ☒ Effective data practices

The State has made progress in ensuring that (please check all that apply):

- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards are measurable
- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels
- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children
- ☒ The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Michigan's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS or QRIS) is known as Great Start to Quality (GSQ). Michigan is committed to ensuring the integration and use of science-based child development principles and practices, which are linked or highly correlated to program quality in our GSQ program standards. Prior to the 2011 implementation of GSQ, we worked with the HighScope Educational Research Foundation to conduct a beta test of the standards with 10 early learning and development programs. Programs in the beta test were accredited by either NAEYC or the National Association of Family Child Care (NAFCC). The standards were adjusted based on the findings of this

test. Michigan adopted the GSQ Program Standards initially in 2011 and reaffirmed them in 2013.

Statewide Alignment – The GSQ standards align with the state's early learning standards (approved by Michigan's State Board of Education), the *Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs* (ECSQ-IT), and the *Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Pre-kindergarten* (ECSQ-PK). Our early learning standards are consistent with and meet thresholds of the National Research Council.

Early Learning and Development Standards – The GSQ standards include early learning and development standards that align with, and have been cross-walked to, the ECSQ-PK, ECSQ-IT, Head Start performance standards, and NAEYC accreditation. The GSQ indicators under the Curriculum and Instruction section incorporate the state's early learning and development standards.

Michigan's TQRIS is clear and has standards that are measurable, reflecting high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children. Michigan's TQRIS is designed to meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and a validation study of this system will occur in 2018. The TQRIS standards are expressed in terms of levels that correspond to a tiered QRIS rating. The levels are organized by five standards of quality: Curriculum and Instruction; Staff Qualifications and Professional Development; Family and Community Partnerships; Environment; and Administration and Management – with identified indicators of high quality within each category. Our tiered QRIS levels measure a progression of improved program quality.

As a part of the GSQ evaluation through RTT-ELC, a validation study of the standards will be conducted. During Year 3 of the grant, a contract was established to complete this study, and a first round of data collection was completed in fall 2016. Upon review of the data it was determined that a pause in this study was necessary to ensure that the overall objectives for validating Michigan's QRIS are met. Upon consultation with the US Department of Education and US Department of Health and Human Services, Michigan developed a revised proposal for a validation study, inclusive of a scope of work that is to begin early in 2018. Within this revised study Michigan seeks to ensure that two data points are included for collecting child outcome data and, therefore, federal approval was obtained to continue this validation study into 2019 with the use of Child Care Development Funds. Preliminary provider and first-round child outcome data will be reported at the end of 2018 to ensure Michigan ends the RTT-ELC grant in compliance.

Applicable to strengthening the tiered Program Standards, results from the gap analysis of the social-emotional and physical health indicators, as well as family engagement indicators, will inform decisions regarding

future modifications to the Program Standards. The gap analysis of the social-emotional and physical health indicators was completed in summer 2016, and the gap analysis of the family engagement indicators was completed in summer 2017. In 2017, a workgroup was convened to discuss next steps for the results of these analyses. Recommendations that propose changes to child care licensing were taken up by a committee working on changes to licensing rules, as part of Michigan's work to amend Public Act 116. This work will continue into 2018. Decisions regarding all other recommendations will be worked into Michigan's planning for the next phase of the QRIS upon the conclusion of the RTT-ELC grant in Michigan.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

Unlicensed, subsidized providers are included in the quality improvement portion of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, Great Start to Quality. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, while home-based providers are registered, and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. Nationally, these providers might be termed family, friends and neighbors. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are not rated using the quality star rating system but are, instead, designated at Level 1 through Level 3 based on their amount of professional development. All unlicensed, subsidized providers start at Level 1 with the required completion of seven hours of CPR, health and safety, and child development training, called Great Start to Quality Orientation. Level 1, or Great Start to Quality Orientation, must be completed before the unlicensed, subsidized provider becomes eligible to receive the child care subsidy. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are eligible for tiered reimbursement once Level 2 is achieved. Achievement of Level 2 is reached through completion of an additional 10 hours of approved Level 2 training. Level 3 is achieved through completion of an additional 10 hours of training beyond Level 2 for a total of 20 training hours. To reach Level 3, providers must also spend 10 hours implementing an approved Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). Both of these requirements must occur within a calendar year of reaching Level 2.

An RTT-ELC activity was designed to increase participation of the unlicensed, subsidized providers in Great Start to Quality – the development of a cohort model focused on supporting these providers to attain Level 2. Contracts were issued by the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) again in Year 4 for all six Great Start to Quality Resource Centers serving seven Pathways to Potential Counties implementing the cohorts. Each of the Resource Centers employs a Quality Improvement Consultant (QIC) for each designated county to implement the cohorts. In addition, a second QIC was hired in Genesee County to implement a second cohort to further support the community of Flint in response to the water crisis. Resource Centers are supported to implement the cohort models locally with technical assistance from ECIC. The QICs are supported in their role with a planned program of training and technical assistance to ensure a base level of knowledge and skill, including adult learning principles, group facilitation, understanding poverty and diversity, and continuous quality improvement.

In Year 4, a total of 337 unlicensed, subsidized providers participated in the Cohorts throughout 2017; at the end of Year 4, 163 were participating actively through engagement activities in the community and early childhood trainings across the nine cohorts. During Year 4, 112 participants reached Level 2 in the Quality Development Continuum, and 59 reached Level 3. At Level 3,

participants are eligible to create a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) with the support of their QIC to continue to improve their quality of care. Recurring themes for participant QIP goals included: creating an indoor/outdoor play area for child care, exploring the community with the children, attending training related to specific topics or ages, earning a CDA/GED/Degree, designing a child care space in the home that meets the requirements of licensing, and becoming a licensed child care provider. During Year 4, four cohort participants achieved licensure through Michigan's child care licensure entity as a result of their individual goals for their Level 3 Quality Improvement Plans.

Contracts for five Great Start to Quality Resource Centers to increase participation for family/group home providers in targeted communities were developed and issued by ECIC. A total of seven Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS) were employed by these five Resource Centers to serve the seven Pathways to Potential counties. The QISs conducted outreach to family/group home providers to encourage their participation in Great Start to Quality and provide technical assistance, as needed. Each of the five Great Start to Quality Resource Centers developed a regional approach for increasing home-based provider participation and participated in continuous quality improvement efforts around the strategies identified in the regional approach. Several regional strategies, including focused phone calls, drop-in visits, and connecting with providers at trainings/events, appeared to contribute to an increase in participation for family/group providers. Participation rates of family/group home providers in the seven targeted communities were 35.04% at the end of Year 4, compared to a state-wide 34.14% participation rate for family/group home providers for the same time period. At the end of the year there was less than a 1% variance between the targeted community's participation rates and the statewide participation rates. The overall Home Based Provider participation rates in the 7 Pathways to Potential Counties increased in Year 4 from 28.41% to 35.04%, an increase of 6.63%.

Participation Bonuses, which were designed to increase participation in Great Start to Quality, continued in Year 4. A Pilot was conducted in Year 2 with a re-launch in Participation Bonuses at the beginning of Year 3, which then continued in Year 4. Bonuses in Year 4 remained open to any licensed/registered providers participating with Great Start to Quality. Eligibility requirements of having served at least one child receiving a child care subsidy within the last six months or participation in the Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) were removed toward the end of Year 3. This change encouraged additional programs and providers to consider participation in Great Start to Quality. All funds set aside for this Year 4 activity were depleted on June 5, 2017. The \$500 Participation Bonus was awarded to 774 programs and providers.

In order to increase efficiency, a specific access to the Great Start to Quality STARS platform was created in Year 1 for 81 Licensing and Regulatory

Affairs (LARA) child care licensing consultants. Training was held in Year 2 to support their understanding of the platform and how they could utilize this resource to support their work. In Year 3, the use of this resource was evaluated, and it was learned that the child care licensing consultants were not utilizing their access because they did not see any apparent value. Further use was under discussion in Year 4 as utilization of the Professional Development Registry information may be more beneficial to the licensing consultants.

The promotion of tribal participation in Great Start to Quality requires the enhancement of systems. A process for tribal programs who may be interested in participating in Great Start to Quality has been established, which will allow them to access the Great Start to Quality STARS platform to complete the rating process, as well as to receive a published, publically visible rating. Unique identifiers were created for these programs to support the process.

The promotion of Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) programs in Great Start to Quality was in the original RTT-ELC scope of work. As discussed in the 2016 RTT-ELC APR, Michigan revisited this scope of work in 2017 to identify an approach that would further incentivize child care providers to include children with disabilities in their care, and to ensure that they have support to feel confident with inclusive practices. Through participation in technical assistance in 2017 Michigan explored what other states had done to leverage their RTT-ELC funds and other funds to support inclusion and made progress on the development of a revised scope of work to propose for federal approval in the first quarter of 2018.

Outreach calls to assist families that have been approved to receive child care subsidy, but have not yet found high-quality early learning and development programs for their children, continued in Year 4. Also, in Year 4, Continuous Quality Improvement efforts carried forward from Year 3 were finalized in Year 4 with Quality Improvement Specialists and Project Managers from each Pathway to Potential County. In Year 3, these meetings were held quarterly; however, the meetings were reduced in frequency in Year 4 due to the major influx of families included in each monthly report call list. The number of families included within the reports increased nearly 50% on a monthly basis for each RTT-ELC county beginning in November 2017, based on the reports from the previous year. It was determined that the reason for this increase was due to changes in eligibility criteria for families to receive CDC subsidy payments. From January 2017 through May 2017, a total of 11,032 calls were made to 3,097 individual families, resulting in 396 searches and childcare referrals made to families.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

In the **APR Excel Workbook** provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	TARGETS									
	Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS									
	Baseline	Baseline	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds										
Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds										
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

ACTUALS																		
Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool																		
Specify																		
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA																		
Programs receiving from CCDF funds																		
Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds																		

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Context: A licensed or registered program is considered to be participating upon completion and submission of a Self-Assessment Survey and issuance of a published rating. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are considered to be participating upon completion of the required Great Start to Quality Orientation (Level 1). TQRIS data is reflective of January 2017 and collected from the Great Start to Quality STARS platform. The number of GSRP, Early Head Start and Head Start programs may be inaccurate as these fields are self-reported by programs, meaning that the data rely on providers to accurately report their information because there is no mechanism to verify the data.

State Funded Preschool: Great Start Readiness Program funds can only be distributed to programs that are at a 3, 4 or 5 star level in Great Start to Quality; number of programs retrieved from CEPI; number of programs in TQRIS supplied by ECIC.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Number of programs in TQRIS supplied by ECIC; number of programs retrieved from the Office of Head Start – Program Information Report (PIR).

Part C of IDEA provides services and supports designated on the Individualized Family Service Plan and does not provide programs or operate classrooms.

Section 619, Part B numbers are reflective of total grantees (regionally operated by ISDs) and not their respective number of total programs or classrooms.

Programs receiving funding from IDEA Part B and IDEA Part C, section 619 are not currently participating in GSQ and are not expected to, as indicated in the check boxes on p. 17.

Title I numbers are intentionally left blank because we cannot reliably report the number of programs utilizing Title I funds - once distributed to ISDs, Title I funds are not tracked for grade-level spending.

Programs receiving CCDF funds data reflect the number of programs that received a payment during the reporting period (both FFN Providers and Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs), provided by Child Care and Development Program, Office of Great Start, MDE.

Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF funding) is total unlicensed subsidized providers who received a payment and who have completed tier 1/level 1 training to receive payment, from January to December 2017.

Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF funding) is the number of licensed/registered subsidized providers who received a payment and who are rated 1-5 stars in GSQ. Licensed Early Learning and Development programs represents total programs statewide (Child Care & Preschool Centers, Group Child Care Homes, Family Child Care Homes), and "Total Programs (1-5 Star)," retrieved from Great Start to Quality Participation Dashboard Report, 1/2/2018 (defined as any early learning and development program licensed by the state that receives CCDF funding). The difference between the two provider types pertains to capacity. Family Homes are licensed for up to 6 children and Group Homes are licensed for up to 12 children with two adults.

All Licensed Programs Combined Total Data provided by ECIC, reflective of all licensed programs in the state, both those that receive subsidy payment and those that do not.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

While the 50% target for all licensed programs participating in TQRIS was not met in Year 4, Michigan expects that this target will be met by the end of the final grant year (2018), as a new round of Participation Incentives will be implemented in the first quarter of 2018.

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:

- ☒ Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs
- ☒ Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability
- ☒ Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency
- ☐ Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (*e.g.*, displaying quality rating information at the program site)
- ☒ Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.

Michigan has developed and implemented a system for rating and monitoring the quality of early learning and development programs participating in GSQ that is rigorous, reliable, and accountable to families, policymakers, and funders.

All licensed and registered early learning and development programs that participate in GSQ beyond the entry point of licensure complete an assessment of quality against the GSQ program standards. Twenty-five percent of programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 1, 2, or 3 Star level are subject to random selection for on-site validation that includes a review of the program's Self-Assessment Survey and uploaded evidence documentation. Once the validation is complete, the program's rating will be published on GSQ at the validated quality level. For programs with a 1-3 Star rating not selected for validation, the self-assessed rating will be the published rating.

Programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 4 or 5 Star level are required to have an on-site validation and a Program Quality Assessment (PQA), after which the program's rating will be published on GSQ. Validators use the Self-Assessment Survey to conduct inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability testing is completed for 10% of all validations on a monthly basis. Assessors complete reliability testing annually on each version of the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tool with High Scope.

Program ratings are valid for two years. After two years, the program starts the self-assessment process again and tries to achieve a higher rating. During the six months preceding the expiration of the current rating, programs are notified and encouraged to re-engage in GSQ in order to maintain a published rating. Once the rating expires, programs may still elect to re-engage in GSQ and earn a new published rating. Additionally, programs meeting a specified list of criteria, such as an increase in quality or a change in license capacity or staffing, may apply for a reassessment of their current rating, which may result in the receipt of a new published rating.

An additional Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge initiative is the development of child care licensing key indicators. To improve the child care licensing inspection process, Michigan contracted with the National Association for Regulatory Administration (NARA) to identify a set of key indicators to monitor for compliance. By streamlining compliance monitoring, licensing consultants will have more time to help programs focus on improving their quality outcomes for children. In 2016, Michigan established a contract with NARA to develop, pilot and refine the use of key indicators in the licensing process. Upon completion of data analysis, NARA provided a report to Michigan, which included the identification of a set of Key Indicators. Stakeholder feedback was utilized to inform the development of eligibility criteria to determine which child care programs will be eligible for this expedited inspection process. In spring 2017, Michigan piloted the key indicators and, in summer 2017, all child care licensing staff were trained on using this targeted measurement tool during the inspection process. Full implementation of the Key Indicators will launch in January 2018.

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application)

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices?

- ☒ Program and provider training
- ☒ Program and provider technical assistance
- ☒ Financial rewards or incentives
- ☒ Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- ☐ Increased compensation

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

To strengthen the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in TQRIS, Michigan has employed a number of strategies, including program and provider training and technical assistance, offering Participation Bonuses, and utilizing higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates. In addition to the seven Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS) now employed through the Resource Centers, Michigan is deploying specialized consultants in the Pathways to Potential communities. Areas of specialization include physical health, social-emotional health, and family engagement. These consultants work directly with program providers to enhance existing services to children and families. This model is being piloted and evaluated during the life of the RTT-ELC grant. Evaluation data from this pilot will be available in 2018.

A technical assistance and training plan for QIS was developed and implemented in Year 4. Also in Year 4, Michigan fully launched the offering of Participation Bonuses to providers to encourage participation in GSQ. During Year 4, the \$500 Participation Bonus was awarded to 774 programs and providers until June 2017, when the available funds were expended.

The Implementation of Quality Improvement Grants (QI Grants) continued in Year 4 with two additional cycles available to providers. To improve the application process, minor changes were made in the internal processes and to the provider support materials between the Pilot Cycle in Year 3 and Cycles 2 and 3 in Year 4. Eligible licensed/registered providers completed an online application requesting funding for activities supporting their individual Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) goals up to the amount of \$4,500.

During Cycle 2 a total of 609 QI Grants were awarded, ranging between \$200-\$4,500, equating to \$2,521,432. The median amount received by

awardees was \$4,140.28. Post-award analysis by region show that award distribution is as follows:

- Central-10.34%
- Eastern-8.06%
- Kent-10.84%
- Northeast-4.27%
- Northwest – 6.73%
- Southeast-15.93%
- Southwest-8.70%
- Upper Peninsula-5.09%
- Wayne-Oakland-Macomb-16.09%
- Western-13.96%

During Cycle 3 a total of 233 QI Grants were awarded, ranging between \$980-\$4,500, equating to \$986,302. The median amount received by awardees was \$4,233.06. Post-award analysis by region is as follows:

- Central-13.73%
- Eastern-7.73%
- Kent-10.30%
- Northeast-3.86%
- Northwest – 4.29%
- Southeast-12.88%
- Southwest-7.30%
- Upper Peninsula-3.43%
- Wayne-Oakland-Macomb-18.45%
- Western-18.03%

In fall 2016 Michigan repurposed \$90,000 of unspent RTT-ELC funds to research and develop a public preschool program model for 3-year-old children at risk of school failure. This activity aligns with Projects 4 and 7 within the RTT-ELC scope of work. Project 4 is intended to increase the availability of high-quality early learning opportunities by expanding access to the quality improvement resources available through Great Start to Quality (GSQ). Project 7 is intended to expand and improve efforts to engage families in meaningful ways and support their development as leaders for their own children and communities. This activity supports achieving the primary goals of both projects by creating a new quality preschool model within Michigan for 3-year olds and their parents.

In September 2017, work began on the development of a conceptual model for state-funded preschool for three-year-old children. The goal of this project is to conduct a comprehensive research and best practice review related to the implementation of existing three-year-old programs and to develop a framework and implementation guide to support a potential pilot program in Michigan.

To date, this work has included:

- Hiring a project manager and preschool content expert to staff the project;
- Conducting research and literature reviews of publicly funded, three-year-old programs nationally and internationally;
- Drafting a needs statement to support the project;
- Drafting, disseminating, and analyzing a "thoughts, opinions and interest" survey completed by approximately 100 early childhood contacts administering four-year-old state preschool and other preschool experts who provided input on critical considerations when developing a three-year-old program;
- Conducting site visits to four locations to observe three- and four-year-old classrooms and to conduct interviews with staff and administrators;
- Conducting research and data review on topic of eligibility and uptake to discern potential impact and inform strategy for scaling up;
- Hosting the first of three convenings of a referent group of program experts and thought leaders in early childhood, who will review and comment on project work and deliverables; and
- Drafting of a preliminary conceptual framework for the development of the implementation manual.

The next phase after research and development is to pilot test the model. RTT-ELC funds supported the creation of the model and state funding will support the pilot test in FY 17-18.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)

In the APR Excel Workbook, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.											
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	TARGETS					ACTUALS					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total Number of Programs Enrolled in the TQRIS											
Number of Programs in Tier 1											
Number of Programs in Tier 2											
Number of Programs in Tier 3											
Number of Programs in Tier 4											
Number of Programs in Tier 5											
Number of Programs Enrolled But Not Yet Rated											

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes

Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

TQRIS data is reflective of a report generated on January 2, 2018 and collected from the Great Start to Quality STARS platform. The total number of programs covered by the TQRIS includes licensed/registered providers considered in good standing with child care licensing and have a published rating on the public website, www.greatstarttoquality.org. Therefore, licensed/registered providers with a status of "inactive" or "provisional" are not eligible to participate and excluded from the count. Licensed/ registered providers choosing not to participate in GSQ or who are not eligible to participate publicly display with an "Empty Star" and are not included in this count. For calendar year 2017 data, a report was generated on January 2, 2018 that shows 8,056 licensed/registered providers were considered eligible to participate in GSQ. Of these programs, 3,738 had a rating of 1 Star to 5 Stars in Great Start to Quality. Data supplied by ECIC.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Targets were not met for Total Programs, Tier 1 (1 Star), Tier 2 (2 Star), and Tier 5 (5 Star) programs during 2017; however, those in Tier 3 and Tier 4 (3 Star and 4 Star) exceeded the target. A large majority of the licensed programs in the higher tiers of GSQ (3-5 Stars) reflect the

mandatory GSQ participation for state-funded preschool (Great Start Readiness Program) providers and their community-based partners. An expanded focus on increasing home-based provider participation and use of proven RTT-ELC outreach strategies in Year 5 should yield further progress toward participation targets in the lower tiers of GSQ (1-2 Stars), since these providers tend to rate within the 1-2 Star range initially. An additional focus to support providers in completing their re-rating as required upon their two-year anniversary will support progress in meeting these targets. Individualized target metrics were developed for Great Start to Quality Resource Centers for Year 5 to ensure continued progress and goal achievement is made through the no-cost extension year.

Taking into consideration the actual number for overall participation for Year 4, GSQ achieved 92.8% of the target number of programs. Actual number to percent of target by Star rating: 1 Star = 33.1% or 124 programs, 2 Star = 57.1% or 427 programs, 3 Star = 112.3% or 1,680 programs, 4 Star = 142.4% or 1,331 programs, 5 Star = 94.0% or 176 programs. Michigan's targets were developed based on the goal of 50% participation by December 2017; however, in this data table, the targets are reflected as hard numbers.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

Michigan considers the top tiers of its TQRIS to be programs rated with 3 Stars or higher.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)

In the APR Excel Workbook, provide data on the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

*In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by Programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.*

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
TARGETS										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds										
First 5 California Child Signature Program										

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.																		
ACTUALS																		
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool																		
Specify																		
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA																		
Programs receiving from CCDF funds																		
First 5 California Child Signature Program																		

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes

Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

State-funded preschool: The GSRP numbers are based on funded enrollment from 2017. All GSRP programs are required to be 3 Stars or higher. Number of children served provided by CEPI.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Data retrieved from Total Cumulative Enrollment-Children, Office of Head Start – Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report – 2017 – State Level

IDEA, Part C and IDEA Part B, section 619 Programs: IDEA, Part C provides services and supports to parents/guardians of eligible children in the environment that is most natural for infants and toddlers, predominantly their home. There is no provision for rating a parent's home. IDEA Part B, section 619 programs are not licensed, and the platform for GSQ is built on child care licensing. Data provided by: Office of Special Education.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA reflects total number of children served by programs receiving Title I funds, retrieved from Consolidated State Performance Report: Part II, School Year 2015-16 (reported Feb. 9, 2017); 2.1.2.3, Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Programs receiving CCDF funds: Data provided by Child Development and Care Program office, MDE.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

Michigan is meeting or exceeding these targets.

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application)

Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) contracted with an entity in 2016 to conduct a multi-year validation study of Great Start to Quality (GSQ), Michigan's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). This study sought to provide the first rigorous validation of GSQ, focusing on the following three research questions:

- How effectively do the GSQ rating levels differentiate the quality level of programs;
- To what extent do the GSQ levels relate to progress in children's learning, development and school readiness; and
- What are the specific local, regional, and state conditions that promote the implementation of GSQ and the increase of higher quality early childhood programs throughout the state and ensure children with high needs receive high-quality care?

The study began in May 2016 and the first round of data collection occurred in fall 2016. Upon review of the data it was determined that a pause in this study was necessary to ensure that the overall objectives for validating Michigan's QRIS are met. Upon consultation with the US Department of Education and US Department of Health and Human Services, Michigan developed a revised proposal for a validation study, inclusive of a scope of work that is to begin early in 2018. Within this revised study Michigan seeks to ensure that two data points are included for collecting child outcome data; as a result, federal approval was obtained to continue this validation study into 2019 with the use of Child Care Development Funds.

Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan. Grantee should complete only those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

Focused Investment Areas

- ☐ (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- ☐ (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- ☒ (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- ☒ (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
- ☐ (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- ☒ (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- ☒ (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- ☒ (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

- ☐ Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each defined age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;
- ☐ Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- ☐ Are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards; and
- ☐ Are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities.

Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

Michigan did not address this.

Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Select assessment instruments and approaches that are appropriate for the target populations and purposes;
- ☐ Strengthen Early Childhood Educators' understanding of the purposes and uses of each type of assessment included in the Comprehensive Assessment Systems;
- ☐ Articulate an approach for aligning and integrating assessments and sharing assessment results; and
- ☐ Train Early Childhood Educators to appropriately administer assessments and interpret and use assessment data in order to inform and improve instruction, programs, and services.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

Michigan did not address this.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- ☒ Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety;
- ☒ Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and
- ☒ Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards;
- ☒ Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards;
- ☒ Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and
- ☒ Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

The Great Start to Quality Resource Centers (RCs) implement Great Start to Quality (GSQ), Michigan's TQRIS, at the regional level. In that role the RCs support early learning and development programs and providers to improve quality through professional development, resources and consultation. Quality Improvement Consultants (QICs) in GSQ are more generalist in their expertise related to quality improvement. Through the RTT-ELC grant, Michigan is piloting a model of Specialized Consultation using Child Care Health Consultants, Social Emotional Health Consultants, and Family Engagement consultants as members of the GSQ quality improvement cadre working with home-based and center-based providers.

A planning team met to develop the model for Specialized Consultation assembled in 2015 and continued planning during 2016, with first steps toward implementation occurring in fall 2016. In addition to developing the model for specialized consultation, this cross-agency team comprised of subject matter experts from the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) and the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC), engaged with an external evaluation team through the Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) to conduct an evaluation of this model. Plans for evaluation were developed in 2017, and details of the evaluation will be discussed further along in this section.

By spring 2017 all Specialized Consultants in each area of specialization were hired in Michigan's seven original Pathways to Potential communities as well as in the region of the Thumb and Upper Peninsula. The planning team providing

leadership to the implementation of this work met bi-weekly throughout much of 2017, working to ensure the successful implementation of this work at the local level. A Purveyor and Coordinator respective to each of the three areas of specialization worked closely together with the Resource Center managers and general QICs at the RCs on the referral process for engaging child care providers in services offered by the Specialized Consultants. Monthly regional team meetings occurred with all involved staff in 2017 to discuss progress, identify opportunities for improvement, and learn from successes.

In fall 2017, a statewide convening was held for all Specialized Consultants, general QICs, RC staff, and the state planning team. This time together focused on evaluation data with an introduction to the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process, as well as identifying best practices and challenges occurring across each region in the state. This meeting served as a springboard for the quality improvement process, identifying opportunities for adjustments in the referral process as well as communication and messaging about these services to providers. Upon review of the data at this meeting, it was identified that stronger emphasis needed to occur on engaging home-based providers, as the majority of providers served up to that point had been center-based.

Progress specific to Child Care Health Consultation in 2017

In 2017, the Michigan team hired eight Childcare Health Consultants (CCHC) and a CCHC coordinator to serve nine counties and regions. CCHCs completed an orientation that included curriculum from the National Training Institute for Child Care Health Consultants along with additional training on Health Equity and Social Justice, Racial Equity, and Safe Sleep. CCHC work in the field began between April and June 2017.

To expand child care provider knowledge of health, safety, and nutrition topics and increase consultant visibility and awareness of services in the community, CCHCs hosted community trainings to Great Start to Quality providers in their counties. Training topics were selected by the CCHC team based on feedback they received from their resource centers (RC). National and state experts and organizations are involved with the development of the community trainings and the professional development of the CCHCs. Topics included Caring for Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Exclusion of Ill Children and Staff, Feeding Little Ones to Help Them Grow, Oral Health, and Emergency Preparedness. These trainings are all approved by the Michigan Great Start to Quality System. At least one training has been held in each county/region served by a CCHC per month. A total of 27 trainings were conducted in the last half of 2017.

Providers who attended these trainings were also given information about the Specialized Consultation (SC) services piloted through RTT-ELC. In turn providers were able to sign up for SC services through the RCs if they felt they

could benefit from SC services. CCHCs provided individual consultation to GSQ providers to whom they were referred. Providers completed an assessment at the first visit of the CCHC to help prioritize the topics of interest, and a plan of care was developed with the child care program. Once all goals in the plan of care were met, providers were exited from specialized consultation. In addition to working closely with the Resource Centers, the CCHCs also established many connections with community resources and provider networks.

Some counties have been quicker to embrace this service than others; however, the case loads of all of the CCHCs are growing. Caseloads for CCHCs vary from three to 17 providers. MDHHS began providing differentiated CCHC services to the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in the fall. Unlike other RC communities, unique opportunities were designed for this geographically expansive and isolated area. Two consultants provided a two-day face-to-face training in October and then a second virtual training in December. They also will provide one-on-one phone consultation as requested but as of December 2017, they have not had any requests for this service. An implementation team along with third party evaluators and the Michigan Race to the Top Governing Body remain involved with the infrastructure development, content expertise, continuous quality improvement, and oversight of the CCHC program.

Progress specific to Social Emotional Consultation in 2017

Social Emotional Consultants (SECs) have all been hired and trained, bringing the total number of SECs throughout the state to 13, in 18 counties. These consultants have been working with local Resource Center staff to process referrals and engage providers to improve the social emotional health and environment of staff, children, and families in their care.

Each new consultant has been thoroughly trained and oriented in both the General and Specialized Orientation processes. These consultants have participated in a Center for the Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) Train the Trainer Preschool series. These consultants have also been reliably trained in the observational tool, the ©Climate of Health Interactions for Learning and Development (CHILD) out of Yale University. Further, each SEC has participated in training for the online data collection system.

Each of the state's 13 consultants receive ongoing reflective supervision, both individual and group, by a local reflective supervisor on a weekly to monthly basis. Additionally, each SEC participates in biweekly phone consultations with the state program coordinator to review cases and increase reflective capacity.

As part of the initial orientation and ongoing professional development, the SEC team received training and continues to receive ongoing support around Cultural Equity work with nationally recognized Dr. Eva Marie Shivers to address issues such as implicit bias and racial inequity.

In November 2017, the State hosted Dr. Walter Gilliam from Yale

University for a meeting with State leadership from MDHHS and MDE, and the Infant Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (IECMHC) workgroup around expulsion prevention research, data and the importance of sustaining the SEC work.

For the consultants who began in the earlier cohorts and thus have had more time to cultivate relationships in their community, there has been an increase in the number of home-based providers that have reached out and accepted SEC services. From January - December 2017, the SECs have worked with over 120 providers, impacting over 3,000 children.

Engaging the home-based provider population continues to be a slow process. Accordingly, the SECs have continued to be intentionally active in community outreach, attending peer group meetings and providing community trainings. These strategies have had the most success in engaging the home-based provider population. Due to the uncertainty of future sustainability of this work, the team had one SEC choose to leave this work to take another position.

Progress specific to the Evaluation of Specialized Consultation in 2017

Over the course of 2017, the evaluation transitioned from design to implementation. Under the leadership of the Specialized Consultation Planning and Implementation Team, priority evaluation questions were derived from the Specialized Consultation logic model, and the evaluation design, methods, tools, and procedures were specified based on those priorities. The evaluation is multimodal in design and includes pulling data from a customized case management data system, completing assessments with providers, survey data collection from providers, and conducting interviews with all program stakeholders.

In order to support both the implementation of the evaluation and the programmatic work of the consultants, coordinators, and purveyors, an interim case management data system was designed and programmed into an online data collection system. Additionally, MDE contracted with an information technology group at MPHI to develop a more robust and sustainable case management data system that can be used for both evaluation and programmatic purposes. This system is designed to follow early care and education providers from the point of referral through exit, capturing each step of the specialized consultation model that providers complete with their consultants. It is also designed to capture key characteristics of the consultants themselves, such as their educational background and training, and their activities outside of direct consultation, such as community trainings and participation in supervision sessions. In 2017, the case management data system was completed, tested, revised, and released, and it is currently being used by Social Emotional and Child Care Health Consultants. The full case management data system transitioned into user acceptance testing by the end of 2017.

In 2017, assessments were identified or designed for each discipline, Social Emotional and Child Care Health Consultants were trained on their unique assessments, and data collection began. Additionally, survey and interview protocols were designed and vetted with the Specialized Consultation Workgroup such that they would be ready for release in January 2018.

As the Caregiving Café model utilized by the Family Engagement Consultants was finalized in the fall of 2017, evaluation methods were designed and vetted with the Family Engagement coordinator and state agency leadership. A data management system was designed to capture recruitment activities, as well as Café participation. Additionally, a post-survey was designed to gather participant feedback. These tools will be released in January 2018 as well. Discussion on Family Engagement Consultation occurs in Section C(4) of this report, "Engaging and Supporting Families,".

Although data collection is still in its earliest stages, the data system is being used to generate on demand reports that are used by MDE and the Specialized Consultation Planning and Implementation Team to track progress and identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement. On a monthly basis, MDE reviews the number of providers served to date overall, by region, and by discipline. As previously mentioned, in the fall of 2017 providers came together for an in-person meeting, which included reviewing early data about providers served and their characteristics, as well as fidelity. Social emotional consultants also routinely request and review data, focusing on fidelity to the model. Data have pointed out great successes in outreach and enrollment, as well as opportunities to recruit more home-based providers and more faithfully follow the specialized consultation model. This work will continue to be implemented and evaluated through Michigan's no-cost extension year in 2018.

In 2017, Michigan convened an Intra-Departmental work group to focus on developmental screening. The group met several purposes, including supporting activities tied to the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) Grant; the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Title V national performance measure selected by Michigan; and the Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge Grant. The work was organized into two goals: (1) Coordinate efforts to enable early learning and care providers to access and share developmental and behavioral health screening with families, while recommending changes to current policies as needed, and (2) Develop a strategic plan for a statewide developmental and behavioral health screening system.

The work group, consisting of state and community level professionals as well as family/parent representatives, developed an implementation plan to identify multiple objectives to support the two goals. Several objectives are progressing, although some have temporarily been placed on hold. Work that has been accomplished includes reviewing existing resources for developmental screening trainings for licensed providers as well as locating materials to share

with providers regarding the importance of developmental screening. A review of Medicaid documents/brochures for necessary updates to align language across agencies/initiatives has also been completed, although changes not able to be made at this time will be made with the next printing of materials. A central repository for information regarding early childhood resources is in the process of being developed at the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), which will be a statewide on-line resource for parents and professionals wishing to know more about developmental screening. To create a strategic plan for developmental screening, the larger group has categorized information to be researched to determine recommendations to address barriers and challenges (e.g., disparities in access to developmental screening, duplicative screening opportunities, lack of awareness by families, etc.).

A lead staff person was identified for this work; however, that person left the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) position in the fall of 2017 and, although re-posted, that position has not been filled. It is expected that the MDHHS will contract with an individual to serve as the lead for this work to ensure it is able to be accomplished in a timely manner.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the **APR Excel Workbook**, provide data on leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable statewide targets. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.											
	TARGETS					ACTUALS					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of Children with High Needs screened											
Number of Children with High Needs Referred for Services Who Received Follow-Up/Treatment											
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care											
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care											

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

MDHHS will produce this data by April 2018, at which time MDE will provide these data for the APR.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Data from previous years reflects that Michigan is exceeding targets. When the data are available for 2017 MDE will update this section.

Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- ☒ Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of your Program Standards;
- ☒ Including information on activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;
- ☒ Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported to implement the family engagement strategies; and
- ☒ Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Over the course of 2017, significant progress was made on all aspects of the RTT-ELC scope of work that includes efforts on Family Engagement. Activities within this scope of work include Family Engagement Consultation, Parent and Community Cafés, Trusted Advisors, Training and Resources pertaining to Family Engagement, and a Gap Analysis on family engagement indicators in Michigan's QRIS.

In Spring 2017, nine Family Engagement Consultants were hired to serve in the seven original Pathways to Potential counties (Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Saginaw, Genesee, Muskegon and Kalamazoo) as well as in the "Thumb" region of the state and a region of the Upper Peninsula. These consultants were trained as trainers in the Strengthening Families™ Protective Factors (SFPF) framework in May. Building upon this effort, Michigan engaged a trainer from the National Alliance of Children's Trust and Prevention Funds in spring 2017 to develop 49 new trainers across the state of Michigan. This training, ***"Bringing the Protective Factors Framework to Life in Your Work,"*** is a series of seven courses that explores the five protective factors, training participants how to work with parents and providers to implement the protective factors in daily practice. Individuals successfully completing the training are certified as trainers and are authorized to use the copyrighted curriculum and related materials to train others.

Following training, the nine Family Engagement Consultants focused on offering SFPF trainings across the state. These trainings have been approved through Great Start to Quality and have been offered to licensed and unlicensed

child care providers. SFPF trainings have also been offered to community members, professionals, and the Great Start Coalitions and Collaboratives through various partnerships.

To expand upon the work of the Family Engagement Consultants, the Family Engagement Specialist has engaged a state leadership team over the course of 2017 to develop and pilot a model for the Parent and Community Cafés. This “Caring Conversations Café Model” provides an avenue to support parents and unlicensed providers as they care for very young children. The Caring Conversations Café model is influenced by emerging information regarding brain architecture, trauma and adverse childhood experiences, as well as the rich studies of resilience that highlight the power of nurturing and supportive relationships and community. This five-series model was successfully piloted in each targeted community during fall 2017.

To inform decisions on the consultation work that the Family Engagement Consultants will offer as part of the overall Specialized Consultation model being piloted through RTT-ELC, stakeholder feedback was gathered in 2017 by the state leadership team implementing this pilot. Recognizing that the general Quality Improvement Consultants who are a part of the design of Michigan’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) that pre-dates RTT—ELC provide some consultation based on the indicators in the system, Michigan worked to develop a strategy that ensures that the Family Engagement Consultants add capacity rather than duplicate existing efforts. Stakeholder feedback continued to be gathered late into 2017, specifically from the Social Emotional Consultants, to better understand the ways in which consultation around family engagement is occurring as part of the CSEFEL model. In addition to gathering this feedback the Family Engagement Specialist began assessing readiness at each local Resource Center to consider where the consultation work may be piloted at the beginning of 2018. To further understand the nature of this work, evaluation of the Specialized Consultation model is underway with data to become available in 2018.

An extension of training on the Strengthening Families protective factors was offered to Pathways to Success Coaches (serving in Pathways to Potential (P2P) communities) as well as eligibility specialists working for the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). This training occurred in spring 2017 and included an overview of the five SFPFs and how to implement them into their daily work with families. Evaluation data collected after this training was overwhelmingly positive; 55 of the 63 respondents graded the conference a B or higher on an A to F grading scale. The same amount said they were somewhat or extremely satisfied with the content, while 57 of the respondents said they would be somewhat or extremely likely to use the information in their day-to-day work.

A second training for this same audience occurred in the Fall of 2017,

engaging 275 MDHHS staff in P2P communities across the state. The focus for this training was using a “Whole Child” approach in service delivery to children and families and included sessions on “Effective Strategies to Work with the Whole Child,” “Asthma 101,” “Bed Bugs, Lice, and Other Infestations,” and two specific sessions led by the state-level P2P unit housed within MDHHS. After the conference, 111 participants responded to an evaluation, rating the overall experience a 3.63 out of five. Two sessions received overwhelmingly positive feedback – Asthma 101 and Bed Bugs, Lice, and Other Infestations. The participants found the information new, relevant, and useful to their work. The other sessions rated slightly lower, but still above average. Overall, when reviewing the qualitative feedback, the Success Coaches found value in gathering together, sharing with each other, and making connections. The participants supplied a long list of future topics they would be interested in exploring moving forward. As this portion of the RTT-ELC grant-funded work has concluded, the P2P personnel at MDHHS are already planning to continue these learning opportunities.

Trusted Advisor Grants comprised of RTT-ELC funds were made available to Great Start Parent Coalitions (GSPC) in 2017. The Great Start Parent Coalitions Trusted Advisor Grants were designed to fund GSPCs, through Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) or a consortium of ISDs, as fiscal agents, to designate funds to design and implement outreach and support activities for families and their at-risk children birth to age five. The goal of Great Start Parent Coalitions Trusted Advisor Grants is to improve linkages to families with children birth to age five who are most difficult to engage in early learning and development programs and related community supports by disseminating culturally and linguistically appropriate materials and information about the importance of early childhood learning and development. A particular interest is to provide supports to individuals who care for young children but are not part of the child care subsidy system.

GSPCs were eligible to apply for \$5,000 - \$60,000 to implement activities targeted toward the specific population(s) identified in the application process. Through careful data analysis the GSPCs proposed activities that support Michigan’s four outcomes that pertain to young children’s well-being: children are born healthy; children are healthy, thriving, and developmentally on track from birth to third grade; children are developmentally ready to succeed in school at the time of school entry; children are prepared to succeed in fourth grade and beyond by reading proficiently by the end of third grade.

Two rounds of funding were made available in 2017. The first round of funding occurred during Summer 2017, awarding a total of \$2,289,031 across 46 GSPC’s.

The application process for the second round of funding occurred in Fall 2017 with a total of 50 applicants. It is anticipated that the second round of

funding will be awarded in January 2018. Technical Assistance is available to all GSPCs during the application process as well as throughout implementation of the grants. Michigan is eager to learn about the effectiveness of strategies being implemented. Evaluation for this work will occur, with the first round of reporting and data collection occurring in 2018. Examples of some promising strategies identified through this process include working with families on literacy skills including many families whose first language is not English, increasing knowledge on the importance of immunizations, and increasing the knowledge of the SFPFs.

A gap analysis regarding the SFPF in the GSQ Program Indicators, Program Quality Assessments, and Early Childhood Standards of Quality (ECSQ) for Infant and Toddler Programs and ECSQ-Pre-kindergarten was completed in 2017. A team of several state leaders from a variety of agencies and disciplines, including parent representatives, worked together to address this charge. The findings were that all five of the Strengthening Families Framework Protective Factors are present in the four documents. However, not all Protective factors are overwhelmingly present in each document; each document was weak in specific protective factors. The committee developed a list of recommendations to address any gaps identified, which were received by the RTT-ELC Grant Implementation Group. Exploration of strategies to address these recommendations is underway.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

- ☐ A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes; and
- ☐ A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Michigan did not address this.

Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

- ☒ Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- ☒ Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including
 - ☒ Scholarships
 - ☐ Compensation and wage supplements,
 - ☒ Tiered reimbursement rates,
 - ☐ Other financial incentives
 - ☐ Management opportunities
- ☐ Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- ☒ Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for --
 - ☒ Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and
 - ☒ Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

In 2017, Michigan AEYC assisted three institutions of higher education (IHEs) to receive their NAEYC accreditation and continues to work with five IHEs to complete the accreditation process by the end of 2018. An additional IHE completed the requirements and had their visit in Fall of 2017, and will receive a decision in early 2018. Some of the challenges faced by other IHEs still in process include changes in lead faculty, lack of staff resources, and alignment with administrative priorities and goals.

During 2017, T.E.A.C.H. supported 594 child care providers utilizing

\$1,785,081.90 from the RTT-ELC grant. A focus on barriers facing home-based professionals seeking training led to the development of a cohort facilitated by Michigan AEYC in conjunction with the Great Start to Quality Upper Peninsula Resource Center and Bay College. The collaboration offered high quality, credit-bearing CDA training in a hybrid format to allow home-based providers in the Upper Peninsula to complete their training in a flexible and comfortable learning environment. The success has intrigued other community colleges in the state to form a similar partnership. Work began in late 2017 to develop a similar cohort in the greater Flint area.

Michigan AEYC collected and organized information from credit-bearing CDA training programs offered through IHEs in Michigan to share in a user-friendly map format online. The interactive map allows providers looking for training opportunities to see all opportunities in one place as well as how their training can be articulated into a degree program. The map will be implemented in the launch of the informational CDA website in 2018 along with information on how to financially support the training and complete the credential process.

An online application was developed for scholarship assistance. Scholarship response time is often slowed by incomplete applications, and the nature of the applicant's work setting often makes tracking down the information difficult. Development of the application provided challenges in making the process simple and easily navigable due to the large number of required attachments scholarship applicants must submit. However, initial feedback in testing has shown that the scholarship acceptance process will be expedited and will, therefore, reduce barriers to early childhood educators enrolling in degree and credential programs.

Also, in an effort to increase the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials, Michigan AEYC partnered with the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) to support home-based providers' use of Quality Improvement grants (funded by RTT-ELC grant funds) to increase education.

An environmental scan of the field indicated that financial support was needed for two additional populations not included in the original scope of work – early childhood workforce professionals who support providers through training, coaching, and mentoring; and early childhood educators and professional workforce support professionals wishing to pursue graduate level coursework. Michigan AEYC requested the use of additional RTT funds to expand scholarship opportunities to these populations. As such, Michigan AEYC / T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Michigan launched workforce support professionals and Master's degree scholarship opportunities. While Michigan AEYC has seen a high level of interest in these areas, specifically Master's degrees, the funding availability limit of one year to support these populations has been a significant barrier to obtaining enrollment. Michigan AEYC will continue monthly outreach to early

childhood focused organizations and programs to increase participation in scholarship offerings for providers and support professionals pursuing a CDA, Associates, Bachelor's, or Master's degrees in early childhood education.

In 2017, Michigan convened a team to participate with the T.E.A.C.H. National Center "Moving the Needle on Early Childhood Compensation" project. The goal of the project is to raise awareness of early childhood workforce compensation issues and create new or significantly expand policy, advocacy, and funding strategies to improve compensation. Leading these efforts, Michigan AEYC began the research process to collect data on public beliefs and knowledge of compensation of the workforce. Michigan AEYC will work with a market research agency in 2018 to develop and administer a data collection instrument polling for compensation knowledge and belief, with a final data report to be published by December of 2018.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1)

In the APR **Excel Workbook**, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.										
	TARGETS					ACTUALS				
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers										
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider										

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Data Notes

The number of institutions increased by 3 in 2017. Three additional IHEs received accreditation from NAEYC. The number of graduates from aligned institutions was obtained from the Michigan Community College Network for both 2016 and 2017 by Classification of Instructional Programs codes: 13.1210, 19.0708, and 19.0709.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

The 2013 baseline numbers on the chart from our initial application were self-reported numbers from the IHEs as to whether or not they aligned their program with the existing core knowledge and core competencies. The CKCCs were updated, released and approved in 2014, so when Michigan reported the following year, IHEs wouldn't have had a chance to align with the new standards at that time. Since the new CKCCs are aligned with the NAEYC's Community College Accreditation standards, it was determined after discussion during the 2014 APR to only use the number of Accredited IHEs and their graduation numbers for the reporting for the APR.

There are seven community colleges currently NAEYC accredited, three additional IHE's became accredited in 2017, and Michigan is working with an additional five to become accredited by the end of 2018.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2)

In the APR **Excel Workbook**, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

See Excel Workbook.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

TARGETS										
Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year										
Type of Credential	Baseline #	Baseline %	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)										
Child Development Associate Teacher										
Child Development Teacher										
Child Development Master Teacher										
Child Development Site Supervisor										
Child Development Program Director (Highest)										

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

ACTUALS												
Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year												
Type of Credential	Baseline #	Baseline %	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)												
Child Development Associate Teacher												
Child Development Teacher												
Child Development Master Teacher												
Child Development Site Supervisor												
Child Development Program Director (Highest)												

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes

Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.

The new database to collect this information was built in 2016 and remained in hibernation mode until a contract for an entity to administer the database was completed in October 2017. While this data remains unable to be collected, it is anticipated that this database will be fully functional in April 2018.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Non-applicable due to description in Data Notes

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:
The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):*

- ☒ Is aligned with the State’s Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- ☒ Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;
- ☒ Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the fourth year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten. States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;
- ☒ Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and
- ☒ Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Describe the domain coverage of the State’s Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

Michigan has piloted a Kindergarten Entry Assessment, called the Michigan Kindergarten Entry Observation (MKEO), with planned statewide implementation by 2020. The MKEO is a developmentally-appropriate tool designed to measure school readiness of incoming kindergarteners across four domains. It is a research-based, valid and reliable assessment that is designed for all students, including children with disabilities and English learners.

Assessing children across multiple domains helps kindergarten teachers gain a better understanding of the whole child—of each child, including areas of strength and areas of need. The domains assessed are:

- Language & Literacy
- Mathematics
- Social Foundations (social and emotional development, approaches to learning and executive functioning)
- Physical Well-Being and Motor Development

A developmentally-appropriate mix of item types are used to create a multi-modal assessment:

- Selected Response Items and Performance Tasks provide opportunities for direct interaction with students on a one-to-one basis.
- Observations can take place in a variety of naturally occurring settings

and groupings, and items are scored using a rubric that includes specific criteria at three levels of proficiency.

Kindergarteners are assessed as:

- Demonstrating Readiness: The child consistently demonstrates the foundational skills and behaviors that enable a child to fully participate in the kindergarten curriculum.
- Approaching Readiness: The child exhibits some of the foundational skills and behaviors that are needed to participate in the kindergarten curriculum.
- Emerging Readiness: The child displays minimal foundational skills and behaviors, which are needed to successfully meet kindergarten expectations.

Children whose readiness skills are “approaching” and/or “emerging” require differentiated instruction, targeted supports, or interventions to be successful in kindergarten.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Michigan provided the TS Gold Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) Tool to schools for three years. Some schools have elected to continue using the KEA in 2017-2018, as teachers found great value in observation-based assessment as it relates to individual student objectives. The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA), developed for Maryland and Ohio Departments of Education in partnership with WestEd and John Hopkins University, was piloted by several Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) and local districts since the fall of 2016, continuing into 2017. The KRA, now called the Michigan Kindergarten Entry Observation (MKEO), will be implemented in three of Michigan's prosperity regions (Regions 4, 5 and 9) in the fall of 2018. Section 104 of Public Act 108 of 2017 (PA108) authorizes the phased in implementation of the MKEO beginning in the fall of 2018. The expectation is that by 2020, all publicly supported kindergarten classrooms in Michigan will be utilizing this tool. The domains assessed are Language & Literacy, Mathematics, Social Foundations (social and emotional development, approaches to learning and executive functioning), and Physical Well-Being & Motor Development.

Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

- ☒ Has all of the Essential Data Elements;

- ☒ Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;
- ☒ Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data;
- ☒ Generates information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making; and
- ☒ Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Establish data collection elements for early learning programs and improve internal and external reporting times

Core early learning program data elements were established in the first three years of the Race to the Top–Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant. The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) maintains the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) application and modifies it as necessary to accommodate legislative changes, the Michigan Department of Education's (MDE's) business needs, and recommendations from the field.

Each year, CEPI facilitates a rigorous data definition process to understand how stakeholders use data and what challenges they have encountered. These discussions cover what data are and should be collected, as well as associated data quality tools, reports and business rules. Stakeholders can then request updates, which are vetted and either accepted or denied.

The data definition process that concluded in the first quarter of 2017 resulted in the addition of two early childhood programs, two new data elements, and multiple business rules to the MSDS Early Childhood Collections for the 2017-18 academic year. The new programs collected are Section 32p(4) Home Visitation, and Early Head Start–Child Care Partnership; the new data elements are Provider License Number and Federal Poverty Level Quintile. Business rules and error checks were created to help ensure accurate reporting of the new elements. These additions will result in more early learning programs being represented in state data systems, allowing existing programs to expand their data use and better understand where and to whom services are provided. The data definition process to plan for the 2018-19 academic year started in the fourth quarter of 2017.

Beyond establishing data elements, a necessary piece of Michigan's early childhood data work is encouraging reporting among programs that are not required to submit data to the state, such as Head Start (HS). The national HS Performance Standards, published in September 2016, have encouraged HS grantees to report student data to state education data systems. CEPI and MDE worked together throughout 2017 to also encourage and provide support to HS grantees submitting data. Nine training sessions were provided across the state to HS grantees in 2017 (as well as representatives from Great Start Readiness Programs, Michigan's state-funded pre-K program). Goals for these trainings included teaching grantees about submitting data through MSDS, showcasing grantees' role in accomplishing Michigan's RTT-ELC goals, and building relationships between the state and the grantees. These efforts resulted in an increased number of Head Start records being submitted in the 2016-17 academic year, compared to 2015-16. Efforts continue to encourage grantees to participate. Michigan currently has 48 Head Start grantees, 33 of whom have signed a data sharing agreement or already had a legal relationship with the state to share data. These DSAs provide a legal basis for sharing data between grantees and the state. In addition, efforts were undertaken in 2017 to incorporate HS into more reports, as described below (see **Continue development of the Early Childhood MI School Data portal**).

Cross-agency work between the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) and the MDE continued in 2017 to connect MSDS data with childcare licensing, Great Start to Quality (GSQ, Michigan's Quality Rating Improvement System) data, and subsidized childcare data. These connections widen the scope of future reports by leveraging additional data elements without placing additional burden on service providers (see **Establish connections with BRIDGES for Unique Identifier Code (UIC) matching and child care subsidy child-level data within MSLDS**, below). Concerning childcare licensing and GSQ data, an updated data sharing agreement is expected to be signed in early 2018. At that point, the infrastructure (i.e., code, database structures) will be in place to quickly operationalize this data connection. Much work in 2017 focused on creating this infrastructure. Partners shared test files and worked together toward a common understanding of how data elements are defined and collected. Conversations about how to employ these data once connected have also begun.

Relationships have been built and strengthened between state government partners, private sector stakeholders, and providers through conference attendance and networking, collaboratively creating documentation, hosting periodic webinars, and creating a HS grantee newsletter (which will launch in January 2018). The goals are to improve data collection and encourage data use, and collaboration is vital to those areas.

Improve Internal and External Reporting Times

Three waves of early learning data were loaded to the Michigan Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS) during 2017: Fall 2016, Spring 2017, and End-of-Program 2017 data. Goals met included:

- Loading and making data available in the MSLDS within 17 business days of final certification
- Submitting reports to stakeholders within a month of data request or availability (on average), with high priority items produced even faster

Establish connections with BRIDGES for Unique Identifier Code (UIC) matching and child care subsidy child-level data within MSLDS

Michigan's Race to the Top–Early Learning Challenge partners, including CEPI, MDE and MDHHS, have been working collaboratively since 2015 to integrate the Child Development and Care (CDC) subsidy program data into Michigan's growing early childhood integrated data system. Integrating the systems will provide for more precise information about the nature and impact of early childhood services in the state of Michigan.

MDHHS collects and houses records of children receiving subsidized childcare and regularly provides CEPI with a list of children who are eligible for services. To meaningfully connect these data to other early childhood programs, CEPI must first match children in the MDHHS data system to Unique Identification Codes (UICs), the codes at the center of CEPI's identity management system.

In January 2017, CEPI tested modifications made in 2016 to the UIC matching process that will enhance this capability. The CDC program is potentially one of the first state-funded early childhood programs with which many children interact. The modified matching process creates UICs for children who remained unmatched after CEPI's standard UIC matching process. In January, the modified matching process was tested and found to be working as designed. As such, the development work is considered complete, and the UIC matching/assignment process was operational for the entirety of 2017.

Discussions continue about what data (beyond child-level data required for UIC processing) need to be shared to support richer analysis. As noted, MDHHS currently shares a list of children eligible to receive child care subsidies. Additional data elements are needed to distinguish which children receive services, as not all eligible children and families participate in the program. Data elements representing whether and when payments were made are expected to be helpful in this discussion, and details are being finalized. To guide this work, a test dataset was shared among MDE, MDHHS and CEPI in October 2017, and an exploratory analysis was conducted to examine patterns in the test data and pilot a connection to MSDS data. Results were shared across partners, leading to conversations to clarify data definitions, plan for meaningful data use, and identify and operationalize next steps. Staffing transitions have slowed work in this area, but progress has been made to build upon the accomplishments of 2017.

Develop and implement data export/import process for Head Start data management systems

Head Start (HS) Data Management

The UIC assignment process described above must be leveraged when early care and education providers submit data about new students to MSDS. The process has been difficult for HS grantees to understand and undertake, as their time and resources are limited. Recognizing that cumbersome processes may be a deterrent for reporting among HS grantees (who are not required but encouraged to submit data), CEPI and MDE worked to simplify these processes in 2017.

After the 2016 Early Childhood Collections pilot, which leveraged an application for manipulating the data files created by a local district, CEPI and MDE continued to encourage HS participation in data collection while striving to improve their comfortability with the application. Traction is growing on the development of a common application program interface (API) to facilitate data exchange between early childhood vendors and state data systems. Michigan drafted a proposal that details how such an API could work. Outreach efforts have continued since the fourth quarter of 2016. Several other states have expressed interest in negotiating this path forward with ChildPlus and other software vendors. As a result, conversations in the latter part of 2017 focused on whether and how the federal Office of Head Start might take a leadership role in finding a multi-state solution. Michigan remains an active partner in this work.

In October 2017, ChildPlus released a report about exporting a data file from ChildPlus in the proper format for upload into the MSDS. The intention of this report was to help entities serving children in the Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) more easily submit data, but it can be utilized by HS grantees as well. The excitement over having this new report was evident in the grantees. As with anything new, there has also been frustration voiced over certain aspects of the report. For example, the report is not downloadable from ChildPlus in a format that can be uploaded in MSDS. CEPI and ChildPlus will continue to work together and improve the report for future use.

Continue development of the Early Childhood MI School Data portal

Two reports developed in 2016, “Kindergarten Pathways” and “Early Childhood Impact on K-3 Absenteeism,” were released during the first quarter of 2017. Customer groups, including elementary educators, school administrators, GSRP staff and directors, and HS staff, were engaged to provide feedback and ensure the reports would be useful. The published reports have received positive feedback from the field, with users commenting on how the reports help them start connecting early childhood program participation with eventual outcomes in school.

Development of two additional reports was completed in 2017: “Continuity of Service in Special Education – Service Pathways” and “Continuity of Service in

Special Education – Service Comparisons.” These reports chronicle, by Intermediate School District (ISD), the aggregated *Early On*® and special education enrollment history of children between birth and third grade and, in so doing, highlight where gaps in services occurred. The reports were developed in tandem, and consumers of these data are expected to use them together to get a broader picture of what combination of services (“service pathways”) children received during three key developmental periods: birth to age three, age three to kindergarten entry, and kindergarten through third grade. The second report specifically shows a comparison of individual ISDs to the state of Michigan in terms of the percentage of children served through certain service pathways. A variety of customers were engaged to ensure these reports met audiences’ needs and were user friendly. The reports will be released to the public early in 2018.

Michigan has also worked to represent HS in existing MI School Data reports. The [Early Childhood Child Count](#) and [Early Childhood Impact on K-3 Absenteeism](#) reports included HS data for the most recent year. Throughout this process, representatives from MDE and CEPI worked closely with HS grantees around the state to get input on how their data should be displayed. For the current year, in the Child Count report, the data will only be available behind secure login. Starting in 2018, the HS data will be available to the public.

Finally, Michigan began work in 2017 to gather requirements for a new report to display the 3rd grade M-STEP proficiency of children who were enrolled in Michigan Head Start and/or Great Start Readiness Programs. This information will be available, behind secure log-in, to the entities that had the children enrolled. The impetus behind this report is to allow entities providing early learning services in Michigan to better evaluate their programs by seeing how children have fared on standardized testing once they are in elementary school. This report is expected to be released sometime in 2018.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income ¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	47,823	6.9%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	96,857	14.03%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	145,197	21.04%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	289,877	42%
¹ Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.		

Data Table (A)(1)-1 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Data retrieved from Kids Count Data Center, Child population by single age (2016) and Children below 200% poverty (2016) (most current data available)

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	17,622	2.55%
Are English learners ²	13,861	2.01%
Reside on “Indian Lands”	2,288	.33%
Are migrant ³	2,630	.38%
Are homeless ⁴	3,317	.48%
Are in foster care	13,369	1.94%
Other as identified by the State	39,500	5.7%
Describe:	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Rural (not in a MSA)	
Other as identified by the State	118,500	17.2%
Describe:	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Urban	
¹ For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).		
² For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.		
³ For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of “migratory child” in ESEA section 1309(2).		
⁴ The term “homeless children” has the meaning given the term “homeless children and youths” in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).		

Data Table (A)(1)-2 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Child population based on [Child Population by Age \(Anne E. Casey\) 2016 Data](#): 690,184

¹Have disabilities or developmental delays: Data supplied by Office of Special Education, MDE.

²Are English Learners: American Community Survey Table B16004 (Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English) 2016 Data; Percentage estimated based on five to 17-year old population subset. Data supplied by CEPI.

"Reside on Indian Lands": U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, S0101+geography

³Are Migrant: Migrant Students Eligible Federal Report (C121) - not for release; 2016-17 Student Head Count, Percentage estimated based on K-2 population. Data supplied by CEPI.

"Are in Foster Care": Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, Factsheet, October 2017, Revised November 29, 2017.

⁴Are Homeless: Data provided by Consolidated State Performance Report: Part 1, School Year 2016-17, table 1.9.2.1 (Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants (Age Birth Through 2 + Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten))).

Children in Poverty (100 percent poverty): Kids Count Data Center (total number, 2015); percent under 5 derived from U.S. Census, (all people, under 5 years, all races below 100% Poverty); divided by percentage of population urban and rural in Michigan (American FactFinder, Urban and Rural Universe).

Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age

Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool			38,241	38,241
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program			
Data Source and Year:	GSRP 2016-17 Counts reflect Spring 2017 data submitted by early childhood providers via the Michigan Student Data System. Spring 2017 data reflects unduplicated children served during the 2017 Spring Reporting Period (11/1/2016-2/8/2017). Supplied by CEPI.			
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	2,560	7,496	27,470	37,526
Data Source and Year:	Office of Head Start - Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report - 2017, Children by Age (A.13)			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	1,013	9,249	16,430	26,692
Data Source and Year:	Part C, Part B, and Combined Counts reflect Fall 2016 data submitted via the Michigan Student Data System. Fall 2016 data reflects unduplicated children served during the 2016 Fall Reporting Period (7/1/2016 - 10/5/2016). Supplied by CEPI.			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	379	758	7,933	9,070
Data Source and Year:	Consolidated State Performance Report: Part II, School Year 2015-16 (reported Feb. 9, 2017); 2.1.2.3, Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	558	6,696	12,778	20,032
Data Source and Year:	Child Care and Development program data, MDE, 2017			
Other 1				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 2				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 3				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 4				
Specify:				

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age

Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Data Source and Year:				
Other 5				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 6				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 7				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 8				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.				

Data Table (A)(1)-3a Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	3,802	221	750	10,845	54	1,723	20,846
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	857	95	240	2,111	11	394	8,653
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,139	111	416	2,132	21	645	11,480
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,092	146	51	10,526	4	10	7,868
Other 1							
Describe:							
Other 2							
Describe:							
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

Data Table (A)(1)-3b Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

State-funded preschool, IDEA, Part C, and IDEA, Part B, section 619 information supplied by CEPI.
 Early Head Start & Head Start Data retrieved from Office of Head Start - Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report - 2017, Ethnicity and Race (A.25).
 CCDF Data provided by Office of Child Development and Care, MDE.

Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development

Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start¹					
State-funded preschool					
Specify:					
State contributions to IDEA, Part C					
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry					
Total State contributions to CCDF²					
State match to CCDF					
Exceeded / Met / Not Met					
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³					
Other State contributions 1					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 2					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 3					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 4					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 5					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 6					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 7					
Specify:					
Other State contributions 8					
Specify:					
Total State contributions:					

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

² Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

³ Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table (A)(1)-4 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.

Note: Michigan's fiscal year ends on September 30th.

Supplemental Funding Early Head Start and Head Start: Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (Title V) funding supporting Head Start and Early Head Start. Data provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health.

State-funded preschool: Great Start Readiness Program - GSRP History of Funding 2016-17.

State Contributions to IDEA Part C: See state reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755.

State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1754.

Total State contributions to CCDF and State match to CCDF: ACF-696 4th Quarter Report.

TANF Spending on Early Learning and Development Programs: Michigan does not directly appropriate TANF funding to directly support the care of children.

State reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1755. Special education expenses are driven by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for each child/student, and thus fluctuates from year-to-year dependent on the number of children receiving services, as well as the intensity and duration of the delivery of the services written on the IFSP.

Great Parents, Great Start: Originally appropriated under State School Aid Act section 32j, Great Parents, Great Start funds were collapsed into the Early Childhood Block Grant in 2012. Great Parents, Great Start is a parent involvement and education program for families with children from ages birth to kindergarten entry.

Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services: Estimate based on programs receiving funding from 31a.

Medicaid School Based Services (SBS): Program helps defray some of the costs of health care and related services delivered to students under IDEA Part B, section

619 and C. Historical funding provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health, latest data available is for 2014. Data for 2015 was not available at time of 2015 APR. Michigan Department of Health and Human Services is working with Medicaid to provide this data for 2016 & 2017.

Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV): MIECHV funding, based on federal awards made to Michigan for the federal grant year. (This does not represent how much funding we have to spend during a particular spending period, only new federal awards that were made during the time frame.) The federal MIECHV awards are included in this chart because they, in turn, contribute to the overall effort in the state to implement a comprehensive early childhood system e.g., home visiting - regardless of fund source - is a resource that contributes to the comprehensive early childhood system.

Office of Great Start Supplemental Funds: Funds for the development of a kindergarten entry status assessment and implementation of Great Start to Quality were appropriated in P.A. 29 of 2012. Funding was made available through 9/30/2015, at a total of \$12,500,000 over the course of three years. Data provided reflects actual expenditures for each year 2013 through 2015. Numbers reported for 2014 and 2015 are corrections to reflect amount of actual expenditures in each year, not including indirect costs.

Early Childhood Block Grant: Funds are appropriated under section 32p of the State School Aid Act.

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>					38,241
Specify:					
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>					37,526
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>					26,692
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>					7,933
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>					20,032
Other 1					
Describe:					
Other 2					
Describe:					
¹ Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.					
² Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.					

Data Table (A)(1)-5 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

State-funded preschool and IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619 data supplied by CEPI.
 Early Head Start & Head Start Data retrieved from Office of Head Start - Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report - 2017, Ethnicity and Race (A.25).
 Title I count retrieved from Consolidated State Performance Report: Part II, School Year 2015-16 (reported Feb. 9, 2017); 2.1.2.3, Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level
 CCDF Data provided by Office of Child Development and Care, MDE.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development			
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)			
Approaches toward learning			
Physical well-being and motor development			
Social and emotional development			

Data Table (A)(1)-6 Data Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool					
Specify:					
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619					
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA					
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)					
Tier 1					
Tier 2					
Tier 3					
Tier 4					
Tier 5					
State licensing requirements					
Other 1					
Describe:					
Other 2					
Describe:					
Other 3					
Describe:					
Other 4					
Describe:					
Other 5					
Describe:					
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

Data Table (A)(1)-7 Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data, if necessary.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget and Expenditure Tables

Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category

Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous budget period and for the current reporting period.

Budget Summary Table

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$707,455.90	\$707,455.90	\$1,093,464.11	\$1,093,464.11
2. Fringe Benefits	\$462,758.03	\$462,758.03	\$678,964.07	\$678,964.07
3. Travel	\$8,909.14	\$8,909.14	\$15,558.08	\$15,558.08
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$33,132.07	\$33,132.07	\$37,806.70	\$37,806.70
6. Contractual	\$8,346,815.09	\$8,346,815.09	\$10,217,490.43	\$10,217,490.43
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$799,129.08	\$799,129.08	\$37,914.39	\$37,914.39
9. Total Direct Costs	\$10,358,199.31	\$10,358,199.31	\$12,081,197.78	\$12,081,197.78
10. Indirect Costs	\$217,655.95	\$217,655.95	\$191,042.61	\$191,042.61
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$281,893.36	\$281,893.36	\$8,469.49	\$8,469.49
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$49,293.93	\$49,293.93	\$157,395.12	\$157,395.12
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$10,907,042.55	\$10,907,042.55	\$12,438,105.00	\$12,438,105.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$10,907,042.55	\$10,907,042.55	\$12,438,105.00	\$12,438,105.00

Budget Summary Table Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

In 2017, Michigan spent 66% or \$12,438,105 of the allocated funding within the Year Four budget. The total budget available in Year Four and associated spending was reflective of carry-over of unspent funds from Years 1 through 3 of the grant. While Year 4 spending increased from Year 3 the expenditures for Year 4 reflect a discrepancy with the overall Year 4 budget that is inclusive of carry-over from Years 1 through 3. The following items have contributed to under spending the total Year 4 allocation:

- Across the Year Four project budgets, there was a total of \$316,650 in unspent staffing funds due to the delay on all projects resulting from the time it took in Year 1 to establish the infrastructure for the grant. Furthermore, turnover in project management staff in Year 2 has contributed to unexpended funds. Staffing has also been impacted by the 2015 merge of the Department of Human Services and Department of Community Health;
- Fringe benefit costs were also less than anticipated, with \$317,278 in unexpended funds. This cost reduction can be attributed to actual benefits coming in under projections as positions were hired, as well as delayed hiring;
- Given the delay on some aspects of the scope of work, budgeted travel was underspent by \$67,122. Year 5 of the grant will rely more heavily on travel funds due to activities in Projects 3 and 7 involving staff across the state;
- Supplies funding was overspent by \$4,600;
- Training Stipends were budgeted for \$5,500, and \$0 was spent due to the availability to utilize Technical Assistance funds;
- Contractual costs were underspent by \$550,737 because of delays within the scope of work. These delays resulted from the time required during Year 1 to establish the infrastructure for the grant, turnover of project management staff during Year 2, and significant delays to Project 3 due to the 2015 merge of the Department of Human Services and Department of Community Health and emerging water crisis in Flint in 2016.

In Year 4 Michigan requested and was approved for a one year no-cost extension. As full implementation of nearly all activities occurred in Year 4, overall spending increased. It is anticipated that this level of spending will continue through Year 5, with additional expenses in Year 5 as grant funding

will be awarded in connection with Project 7. In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will complete spending projections through the remainder of the grant period and submit a proposal requesting to repurpose unspent funds.

* On October 1, 2017 Michigan launched a new system for statewide administrative functions called SIGMA (Statewide Integrated Governmental Management Applications). This system supports all financial management, procurement, asset management, performance budgeting, time and expenses for the State of Michigan. Since the time of the launch Michigan has experienced numerous and significant challenges with this system. As such, with regards to reporting for the RTT-ELC Annual Progress Report Michigan needed to utilize estimates for spending during Oct. – Dec. 2017 for two state agencies that the Michigan Department of Education contracts with for the implementation of grant activities. When the issue is resolved Michigan will re-submit the budget with full details for Oct. – Dec 2017.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The substantive change to the RTT-ELC budget for Year 5 would result from a budget amendment request that Michigan anticipates submitting within the first quarter of 2018. Beyond this budget amendment request Michigan plans to distribute Year 4 unspent funds from travel, equipment, supplies, training stipends, and other lines into Year 5 to support ongoing program work.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management and Governance

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$471,056.44	\$471,056.44	\$722,675.15	\$722,675.15
2. Fringe Benefits	\$368,776.10	\$368,776.10	\$528,840.58	\$528,840.58
3. Travel	\$5,403.34	\$5,403.34	\$9,104.16	\$9,104.16
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$17,917.23	\$17,917.23	\$23,881.89	\$23,881.89
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$55,551.55	\$55,551.55
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,242.75	\$1,242.75
9. Total Direct Costs	\$863,153.11	\$863,153.11	\$1,341,296.08	\$1,341,296.08
10. Indirect Costs	\$92,866.00	\$92,866.00	\$96,407.14	\$96,407.14
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$281,893.36	\$281,893.36	\$8,469.49	\$8,469.49
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$49,293.93	\$49,293.93	\$157,395.12	\$157,395.12
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$1,287,206.40	\$1,287,206.40	\$1,603,567.83	\$1,603,567.83
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$1,287,206.40	\$1,287,206.40	\$1,603,567.83	\$1,603,567.83

Project 1 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

There were no significant discrepancies between the State's approved budget for Project 1 and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is not anticipated that the repurposing request would include a significant amount of funds from Project 1.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$182,313.69	\$182,313.69	\$256,023.55	\$256,023.55
2. Fringe Benefits	\$69,048.77	\$69,048.77	\$68,150.97	\$68,150.97
3. Travel	\$3,371.56	\$3,371.56	\$6,407.70	\$6,407.70
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$9,022.43	\$9,022.43	\$13,924.81	\$13,924.81
6. Contractual	\$6,032,521.52	\$6,032,521.52	\$3,844,976.85	\$3,844,976.85
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$799,129.08	\$799,129.08	\$36,016.83	\$36,016.83
9. Total Direct Costs	<i>\$7,095,407.05</i>	<i>\$7,095,407.05</i>	<i>\$4,225,500.71</i>	<i>\$4,225,500.71</i>
10. Indirect Costs	\$113,917.28	\$113,917.28	\$74,870.20	\$74,870.20
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	<i>\$7,209,324.33</i>	<i>\$7,209,324.33</i>	<i>\$4,300,370.91</i>	<i>\$4,300,370.91</i>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$7,209,324.33	\$7,209,324.33	\$4,300,370.91	\$4,300,370.91

Project 2 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

There were no significant discrepancies between the State's approved budget for Project 2 and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is not anticipated that the repurposing request would include a significant amount of funds from Project 2.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$15,558.44	\$15,558.44	\$88,300.87	\$88,300.87
2. Fringe Benefits	\$12,063.82	\$12,063.82	\$74,504.16	\$74,504.16
3. Travel	\$134.24	\$134.24	\$46.22	\$46.22
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$6,192.41	\$6,192.41	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$36,987.34	\$36,987.34	\$1,027,903.30	\$1,027,903.30
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$654.81	\$654.81
9. Total Direct Costs	\$70,936.25	\$70,936.25	\$1,191,409.36	\$1,191,409.36
10. Indirect Costs	\$350.44	\$350.44	\$2,966.45	\$2,966.45
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$71,286.69	\$71,286.69	\$1,194,375.81	\$1,194,375.81
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$71,286.69	\$71,286.69	\$1,194,375.81	\$1,194,375.81

Project 3 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

In Year 4 Michigan repurposed \$1.3 million from Project 3 due to underspending caused by the delayed start of activities within this project.

Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is anticipated that approximately \$2 million from Project 3 will be included in the repurposing request.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Enhancing Great Start to Quality System

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$28,019.88	\$28,019.88	\$7,239.57	\$7,239.57
2. Fringe Benefits	\$9,359.52	\$9,359.52	\$1,922.38	\$1,922.38
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$463,834.60	\$463,834.60	\$273,056.13	\$273,056.13
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	<i>\$501,214.00</i>	<i>\$501,214.00</i>	<i>\$282,218.08</i>	<i>\$282,218.08</i>
10. Indirect Costs	\$7,694.55	\$7,694.55	\$4,199.41	\$4,199.41
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	<i>\$508,908.55</i>	<i>\$508,908.55</i>	<i>\$286,417.49</i>	<i>\$286,417.49</i>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$508,908.55	\$508,908.55	\$286,417.49	\$286,417.49

Project 4 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

In Year 4 Michigan repurposed \$5.8 million from Project 4 to expand upon the scope of work within other Projects.

Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is not anticipated that the repurposing request would include a significant amount of funds from Project 4.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Improving the Early Learning Child Care Workforce

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$1,496,266.68	\$1,496,266.68	\$2,933,271.68	\$2,933,271.68
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$1,496,266.68	\$1,496,266.68	\$2,933,271.68	\$2,933,271.68
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$1,496,266.68	\$1,496,266.68	\$2,933,271.68	\$2,933,271.68
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$1,496,266.68	\$1,496,266.68	\$2,933,271.68	\$2,933,271.68

Project 5 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

There were no significant discrepancies between the State's approved budget for Project 5 and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is not anticipated that the repurposing request would include a significant amount of funds from Project 5.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, and Educators

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$10,507.45	\$10,507.45	\$19,224.97	\$19,224.97
2. Fringe Benefits	\$3,509.82	\$3,509.82	\$5,545.98	\$5,545.98
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$296,385.26	\$296,385.26	\$1,042,282.79	\$1,042,282.79
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$310,402.53	\$310,402.53	\$1,067,053.74	\$1,067,053.74
10. Indirect Costs	\$2,126.81	\$2,126.81	\$4,610.35	\$4,610.35
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$312,529.34	\$312,529.34	\$1,071,664.09	\$1,071,664.09
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$312,529.34	\$312,529.34	\$1,071,664.09	\$1,071,664.09

Project 6 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

At the start of Year 4 Michigan needed to pause progress with the Validation Study for Great Start to Quality. This activity will start again in Year 5. As such, spending for Year 4 in Project 6 was significantly less than what was budgeted.

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is anticipated that approximately \$1 million from Project 6 will be repurposed due to activities within this Project costing less than originally budgeted.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Increasing Family Engagement

Categories	Year 3: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Year 4: 1/1/2017 to 12/31/2017	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$20,819.69	\$20,819.69	\$1,040,448.13	\$1,040,448.13
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$20,819.69	\$20,819.69	\$1,040,448.13	\$1,040,448.13
10. Indirect Costs	\$700.87	\$700.87	\$7,989.06	\$7,989.06
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$21,520.56	\$21,520.56	\$1,048,437.19	\$1,048,437.19
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$21,520.56	\$21,520.56	\$1,048,437.19	\$1,048,437.19

Project 7 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Underspending in Project 7 during Year 4 is primarily due to the delayed start on activities within this project, including the awarding of grant funds to local communities. It is anticipated that spending in Project 7 will increase significantly in Year 5.

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In the first quarter of 2018 Michigan will submit a proposal to repurpose funds that are identified to be unspent by the end of the Year 5 for all 7 Projects. It is not anticipated that the repurposing request would include a significant amount of funds from Project 7.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 8					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 8 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 9 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 9 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 10 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 10					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 10 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 11 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 11					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 11 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 12 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 12					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 12 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 12 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 13 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 13					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 13 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 13 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 14 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 14					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 14 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 14 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 15 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 15					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 15 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 15 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 16 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 16					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 16 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 16 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 17 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 17					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 17 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 17 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Budget Table: Project 18 – Name of Project

Budget Table: Project 18					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners					
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance					
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)					
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan					
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)					

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 18 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

(Enter **narrative** here)

Project 18 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

(Enter **narrative** here)